


THE ALMORAVIDES
(After the Almohaden)



EMPIRE OF THE CALIPHS IN 750.



MEDITERRANEAN
LANDS
AFTER THE
4TH CRUSADE, 1204



A HISTORY OF EUROPE

CARMELITE MONASTERY
CURRIE ROAD, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

A HISTORY OF EUROPE

FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE PRESENT

By BEDE JARRETT, O.P.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
NEW YORK - LONDON - TORONTO

1929

CARMELITE MONASTERY
GUNHILL ROAD, BRONX, N.Y.

940
J

NIHIL OBSTAT :

F. ROBERT BRACEY, O.P., F.R.HIST.S.
F. WALTER GUMBLEY, O.P., F.R.HIST.S.

MAII 27^o, 1929

NIHIL OBSTAT : G. SMITH, D.D.

CENSOR DEPUTATUS

IMPRIMATUR : EDM. : CAN : SURMONT.

VIC. GEN.

WESTMONASTERII DIE 13^o JUNII, 1929

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO., LTD.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.4
6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET, CALCUTTA
53 NICOL ROAD, BOMBAY
167 MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
221 EAST 20TH STREET, CHICAGO
TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON
210 VICTORIA STREET, TORONTO

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY THE STANHOPE PRESS LIMITED
ROCHESTER : KENT

WESTMONASTERII
DIE 13^o JUNII, 1929

DEDICATION

TO MY FRIENDS IN THE UNITED STATES
IN MEMORY
OF THE EUROPE WE HAVE KNOWN

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I OLD ROME	13
II THE ROMAN LEGACY	49
III CHARLEMAGNE AND HIS HEIRS	86
IV FEUDALISM IN THE MAKING	120
V THE NEW NATIONS	187
VI THE ITALIAN RECOVERY	254
VII THE REFORMATION AND ITS RE-ACTIONS	305
VIII ABSOLUTISM OR REVOLUTION	359
IX THE VICTORIAN COMPROMISE	422
X NEW IDEALS—THE GREAT WAR—AFTERMATH	486
INDEX	55 ¹

LIST OF MAPS

	PAGE
GREECE	16
EUROPE IN THE SIXTH CENTURY	72
THE ROMAN EMPIRE	84
TERRITORY OF THE CAROLINGS	99
FRANCE, ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH CENTURIES	155
SYRIA	168
VOYAGES AND STATES OF THE NORSEMEN	178
IRELAND	250
EUROPE IN 1525	306
GERMANY, 1618	350
WESTERN EUROPE, 1713	383
CENTRAL EUROPE, 1789	398
IRELAND, 1641-1892	404
THE EXPANSION OF PRUSSIA	410
NAPOLEONIC FRANCE	424
EUROPE, 1815	432
ITALY, 1815 TO THE PRESENT	435
THE WESTERN FRONT IN THE GREAT WAR	509

Folding Maps

- (1) THE MEDITERRANEAN AT THE TIME OF THE
CRUSADES WITH (INSET) MAP OF THE EMPIRE
OF THE CALIPHS (750).
- (2) MEDITERRANEAN LANDS AFTER THE FOURTH
CRUSADE—1204.
- (3) EUROPE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

PREFACE

THIS book is primarily intended for students and not for teachers; for this reason it has very little bibliography provided, since a student's reading must be chiefly conditioned by the library to which he has access. The catalogue of his library will be his only effective bibliography.

Again, since the book was written to help students in examination work, a tabulated method of writing history has been frankly employed. This, it is hoped, will ease the trouble of remembering without hurting the value of history as an element in education. These very "tables" may enable a student even better to think out for himself the causes, effects, etc. of the movements or rhythms of the "glad, bad pageant of man." Only by thinking over them will he find his experience enlarge, his ideals enriched, his sympathy and wide-mindedness increased and God more visible in His world.

The first Chapter is not required for examination purposes, hence little detail will be found in it. It merely leads up to the periods, the knowledge of which is required from the student by the Irish and English boards of Universities.

The author has used, in writing this book, chiefly the notes of his undergraduate days, checked by more recent histories and he therefore has to thank his old lecturers for their assistance, given in this public way long ago.

He has to thank also his official revisers, Fr. Robert Bracey and Fr. Walter Gumbley, for countless criticisms, detailed and valuable; further he must thank some critics in Ireland who have helped him to write nearer to the truth—the Very Rev. Dr. McQuaid and the Rev. J. Butler, both of Blackrock College, Dublin, and the Dominicans Sisters, one of whom generously read through a great deal of the book. But though the author has adopted the corrections of these various friends of his, he would

not wish it to be thought that the book therefore represents their views.

To write history well, such sympathy is needed with every phrase of it that the writer may grow too kindly to his characters and not kindly enough to truth; for in reality he must needs love man yet love truth more. Who shall have sufficient width of spirit to do this? None else than Christ our Lord could write adequately of man, and He wrote but once, and that in the dust.

A HISTORY OF EUROPE

CHAPTER I

OLD ROME

THE history of Europe as a single unity has centred round the city of Rome; and Rome itself drew her majesty from the Mediterranean Sea. The story of our future may lie round the shores of the Pacific, but the story of our past has perpetually come back to the Mediterranean. Every now and then the scene of the active culture of Europe has moved north, and ideas and sieges and thrones have to be studied near the Baltic or the North Atlantic Ocean; but after a while even the triumphant Northern nations prove their triumph by entering with pomp into that highway of European pageantry, the Mid-land Sea.

To understand Europe we have to understand Rome and to understand Rome we have to understand the Mediterranean. This ocean, as its name implies, is a land-locked sea, with a natural Western outlet past the Straits of Gibraltar and (within the last half century) an artificial Eastern outlet through the Suez Canal into the Red Sea. Along the shores of the Mediterranean moved for many centuries the culture of Europe in historic time, first to the Far East, for a while to the North African shore, then to the Italian peninsula, afterwards going east to Constantinople, then to France, Spain, and France again, and then to England while she holds Gibraltar and Malta and the Suez Canal, with a vague protectorate over Egypt.

EGYPT

The culture of the Far East was first dominantly Egyptian. Of the earliest history of Egypt we can make only vague guesses at truth, or at least we have facts so few that we cannot yet properly understand their significance. But here, in this history of a later

Europe, we need only to know the little that has direct bearing on the fortunes of Europe.

The first thing to know about Egypt is that she depends wholly on the Nile for the fertility of her soil, and therefore for the support of her population. Lacking rain, as the country does (either altogether in certain districts or only very rarely in others), its necessary moisture can be supplied by the river alone. Hence the Nile, its vagaries and fortunes, has dominated Egypt; Egypt owes so much to it, that in early days it was naturally worshipped as the protector and mother of the land.

It was also along the riverside that the communities of its inhabitants first settled, and, as the river was the reason of their settling where they did, so was it also their common highway of communication: and out of this centre to their communication came also their central government and their king. The priesthood was possibly older than the monarchy, though ultimately subservient to it.

Egypt as we know it in the Old Testament is a rich, imperial and warlike country; but the military power of Egypt has never been very marked. Though the Egyptians resemble the rest of the North African population, which stretches along to the western end of the shore, they never developed, like the Berbers did, into a nation of warriors; on the contrary they have been on the whole peaceable folk, self-indulgent, artistic and contemplative. In historic time they have been often at the mercy of other nations—Assyria, Persia, Greece, Rome, and the Arabs.

As would be expected from such a people, their treatment of their slaves was considerate and of their women kindly. What we know of their religion suggests that it tended to become gross and sensual, with a philosophy which, though vague and inconsistent, was debated with such zest that the most eager of the Greeks came to them to complete their education. However, in spite of this, the exact meaning of the Egyptian theological and philosophical terms is very much in dispute. But not only the philosophy but even the art and literature of Egypt affected the sources of Greece. Certainly its literature must have been very rich; we have still extant remains of every form of poetry and prose, except

—so far as we have yet discovered—that which deals with the theatre. The character of the statuary of Egypt through all its stages is everywhere beautiful, whether colossal or daintily small, with its air of peace, the sitting figures with hands on knees and the eyes looking neither up nor down, but straight out in the endless and undulating desert.

The men who carved the primitive statues of Greece were certainly inspired by Egypt; and even medieval art reaching back through Byzantium is Egyptian art, reborn and baptized.

Perhaps the two things which the name Egypt first suggests are mummies and pyramids. That is as it should be, for the great pre-occupation of Egypt was the idea of death and the after-life; and the pyramids are tombs. Belief in the immortality of the soul and its personal survival after death was the best bequest of Egypt to the pagan world, for it was more clearly taught here than elsewhere in paganism. This doctrine moved triumphantly from Egypt along the shores of the Mediterranean and everywhere confirmed the native hope of human hearts in a life to come. We have to think of Egypt then in its relation to Europe not as a military state, but as the centre of a great tradition of thought and religion—a religion first of all gross and sensual and, as far as the people were concerned, always remaining so; but, with the more intelligent, becoming vaguely mystic, symbolic and priestly.

It is natural therefore to note that Egypt has never flourished under a purely military government.

GREECE

The next great influence on Mediterranean culture came from Greece, which was the very antithesis in almost every point to Egypt, although it was from Egypt that had come so much of her inspiration. Egypt was of the East, but Greece was essentially a Western nation as we now use the term; historically she was then no nation at all, but a collection of little cities, independent, warring with their neighbours and proud of the separate spirit that each of them cultivated apart. The difference between these two



civilisations is very great. Whereas, for instance, Egypt had a religion, Greece had none. Greece was clear and philosophical, definite, active, sure. The Greeks were capable always of fine military effort. They could spin theories with the utmost subtilty. They could carve, build and sing; they could be poets at every point, heroic in their epics, noble in their tragedies, tender in their love songs, witty in their comedies, full of the delicate colouring of the dawn and sunset in the choruses of their songs of the light. But mysticism was, with rare exception, never their achievement nor desire. They were the embodiment of paganism in its loves and limitations; in their clear, direct vision, they lacked the sense of misgiving or even of personal sin, pursuing their firm ideals, which were generally limited enough to be capable of being achieved.

Its only mysticism was a foreign thing, imported from the East. Yet on the whole the East was the land of its enemies. It dreaded the East. Its own three great gifts which it brought to Europe were freedom, thought, and a love of natural beauty. All these three were threatened by the East.

Persia, therefore, which was in the early and critical years of Greek history the most potent Eastern Power, and her nearest neighbour, found in Greece her earliest foe. Later, Persia was to become infected by the Greek genius, but for the moment she lacked both philosophy and freedom, and retained the Eastern love of the fantastic, as opposed to the natural, beauty. Greece therefore (led by Athens which was the radiating centre of her special genius) resisted and defeated Persia in a series of memorable battles:

- (i) In 490 B.C. at Marathon in Attica, the very district in which Athens was situated.
- (ii) In 480 B.C. in the Bay of Salamis, off the Athenian coast, by the navy commanded by Themistocles, an Athenian.
- (iii) In 479 B.C. at Plataea, north of Athens, on the far side of her protecting hills, by an army led by Pausanias of Sparta.

In this warfare, Persia was the attacking side; Greece only resisting to preserve her freedom. It is not to be thought that Athens was the only Greek city engaged in this defence of thought, freedom and love of the natural world, but she was the leader of the defence, and her confidence inspired the rest. Still, Sparta must be remembered for her defence of Thermopylæ (480), which delayed the attack on Greece and which gave the other cities courage and hope by showing them how a handful of men could, by heroic resistance, defy hordes of soldiery. Though the Persians broke through the pass at the end of the fighting, no Greek ever forgot the glory of that heroism. It heartened Greece. But just because after these battles the Persian danger was once for all removed, the cities of Greece (which in a common defence

of their native soil had been driven to some co-operation) were no longer forced into unity, but fell quickly apart. Indeed, by natural instinct they were so busy working out their own personal development, and in fact were so successful at this, that they forgot to ask whether each had not need of each in their mutual advancement, and never went to the further stage of discovering themselves a single whole. It is true that their Olympic games and their common oracles gave them a sense of kindred, but this resulted very largely in little more than a common disdain of the rest of the world. They only united in this, to despise everyone else. Yet in spite of all that they failed to accomplish, we can be grateful for this splendid development of each city, which gave us *Athens* under the leadership of Pericles (d.429 B.C.),* with its noble art and thought, its architecture, its sculpture, its literature, its love of the world present to eyes and ears and senses, and its admirable philosophy; *Sparta* with its austerity, its discipline, its fierce unity, and its military efficiency; *Thebes* with its heroic legends and strange disloyalties, its heavy and countrified soldiery, and its sudden leap to prominence under Epaminondas, who combined skill in planning with swiftness of execution, and balanced his supreme military strategy with moderation and mercy (killed at Mantinea 362 B.C. in a war against Sparta); *Corinth* with its unrivalled harbour, its skill in commerce, its mechanical inventiveness, its wealth and richness of artistic decoration, its ennoblement of trade, and its ultimate degradation of art through treasuring rather the splendour of the material than the gracefulness of the form, and through its self-indulgence. But though this individuality of each city of Greece, and its flowering in such varied profusion had its value in the creation of our culture, the price paid for it was

- (i) Isolation of each city from the other.
- (ii) Jealousy of each city for the other.
- (iii) Inter-city war.

Athens' supreme success, for instance, made her despise her allied cities, tyrannise over them, antagonise them, and then,

* Gilbert Murray's *History of Ancient Greek Literature* is useful and valuable.

deserted by them, fall at last a victim to the narrow efficiency of Sparta, for she had finally succumbed to her dreams of self-aggrandisement and had tried to seize Sicily and to give herself an empire over conquered Greek cities.

In 413 her army was crushed at Syracuse, in 405 her fleet destroyed at Aegospotami, and in 404 her walls razed to the ground. She never recovered. (The description of this expedition to Syracuse, its betrayal by Alcibiades, and the terrible fate of the Athenian troops overwhelmed in the quarries outside the city are described by Thucydides in the Xth Book of his History of Greece, and even to-day the vivid story sickens the reader at this awful ending to so much culture, so much glory, such unbounded pride.) Sparta, which then took over from Athens the leadership of Greece, was herself defeated and humbled by Thebes, which could not, however, keep her supremacy after the death of Epaminondas.

Sparta and Athens represented supremely the two racially different types of Greece—Sparta, Dorian, and Athens, Ionian; Sparta by choice supreme on land, Athens, on sea.

Sparta was an oligarchy, governed by two kings in rotation, Athens a democracy; Sparta was conservative and afraid of responsibility, Athens energetic and eager to rule. Of the two, Athens has had greater influence on the Mediterranean, chiefly because of her richer art and more democratic ideas of government. If it be true that Greece stood for thought, freedom, and a love of natural beauty, it is Athens that created these and gave them to Rome and through Rome to us.

Two things chiefly should be remembered of the Athenian democracy:

(i) The whole body of citizens met and decided every point of foreign and domestic policy, and controlled the Government.

(ii) The officials of the State and the Council of Five Hundred (a Senate) were chiefly chosen by lot.

For these two points show us the dangers of the Athenian governmental system and remind us

(a) That representative government was unnecessary where direct control was practised by the citizens.

(b) That the slaves and non-free members of Athens, though far outnumbering the citizens, had no share in the government of the city.

The last item in the Greek influence on the Mediterranean, which need be mentioned here, was the rise of Macedon under Philip and its wide empire under Alexander. Though the rest of Greece did not consider Macedonia sufficiently pure in blood to be accepted as a genuine Greek State, out of courtesy it allowed the kings of Macedon to be accepted as genuine Greeks. However, Philip, if not a barbarian in the technical sense of the word, was a barbarian in his methods. As a hostage in Thebes he had learnt from Epaminondas the arts of war and government and the principles of public policy, and had practised those arts with success. Denounced by Demosthenes as a tyrant and opposed by Athens, Thebes, and Corinth, Philip at the battle of Chaeroneia (338) defeated his opponents crushingly and ruled Greece till his assassination two years later (336 B.C.). He was followed by his son Alexander (336-323), who had had Aristotle as his tutor. Not unworthily has Alexander been called the Great—great in his military genius, great in his statesmanship, great in the extraordinary effect his action produced on the history of the world; great in his endowments of body, mind and genius, beautiful as a young god.

His first wars were against Persia, which he was able to defeat, since the imperial army was ill-organised and ill-trained and yet so numerous that when they should have been launched in attack they were too closely herded to move with the necessary freedom, and in the moment of defeat few could escape. Moreover, the Macedonian troops were professional soldiers, experienced and well armed. Alexander's method was to use (i) his phalanx of footmen with long spears, arranged in ranks so as to meet a charge and break it, or to charge itself and (ii) his famous heavy cavalry in the final assault to decide the battle. These two arms could defeat any force brought against them. Not till 168 B.C. at Pydna was the Macedonian phalanx ever defeated. Then, however, its power was broken by the Roman legion and short Roman sword.

After Issus (331), in which battle Darius was overwhelmed, Alexander passed over to Egypt, founded the city of Alexandria, and visited the temple of Ammon, where the Egyptian priests saluted him as a god. He marched back again to defeat the Persians at Arbela (331), and then proceeded to capture in turn the great Persian cities. He led his troops

North to the Caspian

East to Afghanistan

South to India (Sindh).

Here in the Punjab, by the banks of Hyphasis, his troops mutinied, but he returned to Babylon only in order to plan new conquests to the West. Before he could accomplish them, he died in 323, after a banquet. He is said never to have recovered from a fever caught from bathing in the icy waters of the Cydnus, when he was overheated by the eastern sun in 334.

The stories told of Alexander show him to have been by nature noble and trustful, with large views and fine visions. But his expedition in the East and his long exile from home made him forget his Greek ideals, and he became infected with the theories of royalty held by his new subjects.

In Egypt he began to assume divine honours, and in the farther East he surrounded himself with mystery and held himself aloof like a Persian or Assyrian monarch. He is not the only instance, as we shall see, of the difficulty always encountered by the Westerner who triumphs in the East, of knowing how to make himself acceptable to the East without losing those Western qualities which have made him a conqueror. We shall see throughout European history that the East has often been conquered by the West, and the West in turn undermined by the East, and that in the East the only lasting Western influence has been that which has known how to absorb all that the East has to give without losing hold of Western energy, activity and clearness of sight. Chiefly this has been the Catholic Church. It is idle to speculate on what might have happened if Alexander had really turned to the West and conquered Carthage and Rome, and recovered his earlier fineness of character and statesmanship.

He left no heir; so his empire fell apart under the various

generals he had left in charge of his different provinces and kingdoms. The principal names of these generals to be remembered are:

Ptolemy, who held Egypt.

Seleucus, who held Syria and Persia.

Antigonus who held Asia Minor.

The influence of Alexander's conquests was enormous, for everywhere he looked upon himself as the missionary of Greek ideals, consequently he spread everywhere knowledge of the Greek language, Greek philosophy and Greek art. No country that he reached was ever again wholly as it had been, for the Greek ideals have been the most vital in European, indeed in world, history; they languish, but they never die.

By introducing Greek thought and the Greek language everywhere, Alexander enabled Christianity three hundred and fifty years later to spread itself very far East through the Greek gospels and the Greek fashion of speech. Indeed, when it did come, Christianity, though centred in Rome and Palestinian in origin, was dominantly Greek in culture and language till the first schism of the Greeks forced orthodoxy to become increasingly Latin in policy and discipline.

CARTHAGE

Had he turned Westwards, the power he would first have had to meet would have been Carthage, a colony or overseas-dominion of Tyre. It was Semitic in origin, more purely so than Egypt, which also in its monuments shows its population to have had a Semitic cast of countenance and even Semitic culture. By Semitic is meant that division of mankind which, according to the old tradition of the Book of Genesis (chap. x), was descended from the eldest son of Noah. Sem is looked on as the father of all the races normally considered to be akin to the Jews; Cham of the dark races east and south of Palestine; and Japheth of the fair races to the west and north.

Carthage was therefore in origin Phœnician, and was an outpost for trade planted on the North African shore opposite Sardinia and the most westerly point of Sicily. The colony never

owned its own city, but paid rent for it to North African tribes. The name Carthage means, in the original Phœnician, the New Town, and its position must have been exceptionally good for trade, since two hundred years after its total destruction by the Romans it had become in size and prosperity the third city of the Empire.

(i) Its foreign history is chiefly concerned with a series of wars in Sicily and Sardinia and Spain; at various times it held the whole of Sardinia and almost the whole of Sicily and Spain; but never for any length of time was it able to keep its subject people contented.

(ii) In the account of its wars the same names occur generation after generation: Hannibals, Hasdrubals, Hamilcars are always amongst its leading generals, and it is therefore supposed that these were members of the same great families. It was probably governed by a small group of wealthy merchants.

(iii) Its troops were generally paid troops; only at the very end of her history did Carthage rely upon her own citizens. But her mercenaries were a standing army, experienced and well drilled.

(iv) Its navy was its chief force, and it was at first as a naval power that it was able to meet and vanquish Rome. Its navy in some measure was necessitated by its commercial system, for, having comparatively little territory at home on its North African shore, it needed a fleet to protect its ships in carrying goods to the scattered Mediterranean ports. But trade was not the only motive that made them take to the sea. The Phœnicians were a sea-loving race. For instance, when King Cambyces captured Egypt in 525 B.C. and threatened to sail along the shore to Carthage, his own navy was so largely composed of Phœnicians that their refusal to take part in any expedition against their kindred in the New Town prevented him from carrying out his design. Again, we have records of the voyage of a Carthaginian who went south round the shoulder of Africa to Sierra Leone and even perhaps reached the Cape of Good Hope. We know of their ships having touched the Spanish coast, having ventured beyond the Mediterranean

through the Straits of Gibraltar, and having regular trade with Britain and Ireland. They were not afraid of the sea; they dared the Bay of Biscay and the Atlantic, which even the Romans at the height of their greatness were never able to achieve.

(v) The Constitution of Carthage was praised by Aristotle, who gives us a fairly comprehensive account of it.

(a) It had two kings, elected for life, but who else, according to Aristotle, were in all respects like the kings of Sparta.

(b) There was a Council of One Hundred, which had evidently power both of deliberation and of restraint, and must have been composed chiefly of the conservative element of the city, since its foreign and home policy never varied through all the centuries of the city's existence.

(c) There was the more popular Assembly of the citizens of Carthage; but its effective powers must have been very small, for we never hear of its intervening in national policy or public appointments.

(vi) We notice also in the history of Carthage:

(a) Offices tended to accumulate in the hands of the same men.

(b) The same families continued generation after generation to hold office, at home and abroad.

(vii) Some curious social customs are interesting to notice:

(a) There was much club life; we hear also of guilds and companies; we have evidence of common meals, but we do not quite know whether these "common meals" were any more socialistic than the modern restaurant, or the practice of eating in public in a club dining-room.

(b) Political business and State affairs were transacted at night.

(viii) Economic conditions are also not hard to discover:

(a) There was a tariff of protected articles, and a customs, rather to raise revenue than to stimulate trade. Smuggling consequently was a prosperous profession.

(b) The mines were owned, some by the State, some by private individuals. We know instances of both.

(c) The chief objects of their trade were gold, ivory, slaves, wax, honey and copper.

(d) The currency was of pieces of curiously stamped leather, corresponding partly to a paper currency and partly to cheques drawn on a State bank.

(ix) Oddly enough, in contrast to all this rather commercial and industrial organisation, the only surviving Carthaginian book is on agriculture, written by a man called Mayo, who begins it with a happy sentence that should be inscribed in the collection of wise sayings of the world: "To make a farm prosper a man must sell his town-house." Was agriculture honoured by the Carthaginians in spite of their lack of territory for it at home, or is this book part of a reaction policy of Back-to-the-land?

(x) The religion of Carthage was not different from that of the land from which its stock had come, Moloch reappearing under the new name of Baal Hammon, both names being of Semitic origin. Again, Meleant was the tutelary god both of Carthage and of Tyre. Naturally Carthage worshipped a sea god, no other than Dagon, the fish god, who is also Palestinian; and Tanit, the other great religious object of worship, seems to have all the characteristics of Astaroth or Astarte, the goddess of love. We can be sure that the religion of Carthage was cruel and foul, from the judgments the Romans passed on it. But it is curious how little the Carthaginians respected religion, and how often in their wars they were accused of committing "acts of impiety" which brought disaster on them, defeat in war or plague at home.

(xi) If we can generalise from the system of taxation introduced by Carthage into Sicily (and this explains why she never retained the loyalty of her subject peoples), she treated her conquests severely:

(a) Much of the land was expropriated and rented out at one third of the value of the annual crop.

(b) The land not so expropriated, but left to the cities, was still claimed for the government and taxed to pay tithe on pasture land, a double tithe on agricultural land, and a cash tax per head on cattle.

(c) A few cities, however, were left untaxed or to an optional tax, no doubt with compensating advantages if they did tax themselves.

(xii) Of the art of Carthage it is enough to say that as far as can be known now it produced nothing original. It was purely imitative.

The only portion of the history of Carthage that concerns us in any detail will be mentioned in the account we shall have to give of its wars with Rome. But this is noticeable, that wherever the Greeks or Romans were at war with Carthage, however near defeat they might be in a campaign, they could nearly always save themselves by sending an expedition against Carthage. Such a manœuvre immediately caused a panic in this commercial city with its wealthy millionaires. Once its walls were threatened, it recalled its generals and their armies, however near these might be to overwhelming victory, in order to defend itself. It lacked the courage born of a sense of greatness. Thus was Syracuse saved from them when Agathocles was almost in their grasp at Gela in 309, and thus was Rome herself saved later from the advance of Hannibal. Carthage showed herself devoted to commerce, subject to dreadful panics, and without the spirit of heroic adventure needed for an empire if it is to become great. "Great empires and little minds," said Edmund Burke, "go ill together."

The Carthaginians were traders who stumbled on an empire, which had cost them only money, and in the achievement of which they had lost no blood of their own. When at their last defeat by Rome they saw their fine navy burnt before their eyes, deliberately and in cold blood, they watched this hurt to their honour with dry eyes. They wept and wailed only when they learnt the crushing indemnity they had to pay. The lost empire troubled them less than the lost gold.

PALESTINE

Before turning to Rome there is one other State to be mentioned, whose shores border the Mediterranean and whose influence on Europe has been great, indeed supreme; yet we cannot venture here even to give a résumé of its history, for the tale of Palestine is a tale to be learnt elsewhere. However, the following dates and facts will help to give a general view of the history of the Holy Land in relation to the history of the rest of the Mediterranean.

B.C. 1000. David the king.

876. Achab married Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre.

743. Isaias began his prophecy.

640. Josias defeated by King Pharaoh-Necho of Egypt, who ruled Judea through its princes till his defeat by Nebuchadnezzar at Charcemis in 606.

586. Destruction of Jerusalem and its princes taken captive to Babylon.

538. Cyrus, the Persian, allowed some of the Jews to return (i.e. the Persians had conquered the Babylonian empire). The second temple was founded.

333. Alexander conquered Syria and destroyed Tyre (332) and received the surrender of Jerusalem.

320. Ptolemy I took Palestine and Syria.

314. Seleucidæ wrest back Palestine.

301. Palestine restored to Egypt.

198. Recovered by Antiochus IV for the Seleucidæ, and his efforts to paganise and Hellenize produced the Asmonean and Maccabean revolts.

142. Asmodean dynasty founded under Simon, brother of Judas Maccabæus.

64. Syria a Roman province.

37-34. Romans aid Herod to capture Jerusalem; beginning of Idumean dynasty.

A.D. 6. Quirinus legate in Syria.

18-36. Caiphas high priest.

26. Pontius Pilate governor.

52. Felix made procurator.

60. Festus made procurator.
67. Vespasian conquered Galilee.
70. Titus captured Jerusalem and destroyed the temple.

ROME

We have reached the point where we must proceed to tell the story of Rome herself. Her character was created in her by the effect of all she was driven to achieve; she absorbed some new element in her character with each new conquest; she grew in the richness of her capacity by each work forced on her by her circumstances. She does not seem restlessly active, like the Greeks; nor commercially adventurous, like Carthage; nor a religious centre, like Palestine; nor contemplative, like Egypt. She was of herself sturdy, simple and agricultural. She was forced by circumstances to advance and capture, and to rule; and finally to become not only the mistress of the world, but the world itself as it was then known, *orbis terrarum*.

The history of Rome unfolds in its earlier pages into a story of "inevitable greatness," as though she became great through overwhelming destiny. The Roman historians thought this to be the true explanation of Roman development; for Livy, Rome was a sacred city divinely shepherded to greatness. Again, on the Arch of Constantine, still standing by the Colosseum, runs an inscription ascribing Roman triumphs to the divine inspiration. For Dante, Rome was as clearly a chosen city as Jerusalem, and the Romans, as much as the Jews, a chosen people, and their empire the very counterpart of and remedy for the dispersal of the Jews.

Rome was thus a city of war. But Rome was also a city of law and government. Thus she did not merely conquer, but she maintained herself in her conquests. Moreover—and this was her crowning accomplishment—she brought her conquered territory into a real unity with herself. Thus the Empire, which was the whole world, yet had an individuality and was a living organism. It was held together so that it had a single life. No part of the Roman world has ever become free of her influence nor ever will be. She has moulded the Europe we know; and,

through us, the modern world, the Far East and the new countries have all received her inheritance. Even the Mohammedan countries, which alone established themselves fiercely against her, have at last succumbed. Turkey has in 1928 accepted the Latin alphabet. The geographical position of Rome undoubtedly helped to give her a central hold on Italy. But this only means that her position was a condition or an opportunity for greatness. It did not compel her to become great. Many cities have had fine positions yet have failed to achieve greatness through them. Once, it was actually debated whether it would not be better to shift the centre of Roman rule and military effort to the city of Basle or even Nicomedia. These by their position could have been pivots of empire. They were deliberately set aside. It is man's will which is the chief condition of a city's greatness. Other things may make the achievement of his purpose easy or hard to him, but it is the will that achieves the purpose; helped or hampered, it is the will.

This being said, we can now repeat that the position of Rome at the geographical centre of Italy gave her, once she began to expand, a fine opportunity for organising her growing territories. Even her position on the Tiber helped her (though she was so far inland) to become a convenient centre for commerce, both to the plains above her and to those who could be reached by the sea below. Her land leant westwards, but she was protected by the Sabine hills near her, and further back by the great range of the Apennines, which ran in an almost unbroken curve round from the Southern Alps over Genoa to the extreme south-westerly point of the toe of Italy, and formed a shield that protected Rome from almost every approach but the sea. The daring of Hannibal, indeed, broke through Alps as well as Apennines; but the Alps and Apennines are a protection nevertheless. So much so that the great Italian cities are almost entirely (save for Venice) on the western side of Italy and under the shelter of that curve.

Commercial beginnings are the first authentic knowledge we have of Rome. The legends of the Great Twin Brethren and the mother wolf are later additions. It is not very easy to guess what

these legends stand for. Possibly they were inherited from the older rites of the Etruscans, whose language is only now being understood. Of course, under the Capitol Hill a rather unhappy wolf to-day runs feverishly round its narrow, darksome cave, and stops at intervals to glare out of its caged front. But this does not make the legend any more intelligible. We remember the legend; we would like to know how it grew up.

Behind Rome, reaching up to where now is Florence, was the territory of the Etruscans, a strange people, of unknown origin, with a baffling language and a not very intelligible religion. The Romans learnt a great deal from the Etruscans; they may have learnt this legend from them as well.

The Romans, however, did not at first (Rome was said to have been founded 753 B.C.) learn much more than fighting. Their first fight may have been with these very Etruscans, whose princes perhaps ruled over them. These little princes the Roman love of majestic terminology afterwards dignified as kings. They were ultimately driven out (510 B.C.). Rome was henceforward, till the Cæsars came five hundred years later, a republic, *RES-PUBLICA*—THE PUBLIC THING.

It took another hundred years, after the Etruscans were expelled, for Rome to resist the pressure of her neighbours from the hills and higher up the Tiber, but she gradually overwhelmed them, and found herself in the end at the head of a league of cities. It is not very clear why these cities first fought with each other. It may have been merely to determine which amongst them was to be the leader, so that once this had been settled, each could then go about its business in security. That was certainly the result of the fighting. Rome won, and at once the rest of the cities settled to their life of commerce, love and art under her sovereignty. The world of Rome's creation had begun. Note this handful of dates:

- 450. Rome became head of the Latin league.
- 395. Capture of Veii, the head of the Etruscan league.
- 390. Sack of Rome by the Gauls and its recovery.
- 343. Samnite wars began; a seventy years war with the rest of Italy; Greeks in Campania and S. Italy, Latins in

the Samnite country and Sabine Hills; the Etruscans and Gauls.

282. Save for the Greek cities, Rome had secured her hold over all Italy, which was now allied with her.
275. The Greeks under King Pyrrhus of Epirus were defeated at Beneventum. All Italy up to its north-eastern corner now held for Rome.

Rome built up her conquests very slowly; but she was a wise ruler. She treated her subject cities really as allies and won them to her scheme of unity. She had already begun by giving them an example of domestic unity within. She had set her own house in order before she moved to unify her allies. Firstly, from the date of the dismissal of the kings two consuls were elected annually as the executives of government; this double consulate lasted even beyond the time of the Cæsars. The consuls were commanders of the army and the supreme judges, and had actually to lead the troops in time of war. Secondly, there was the Senate, which, beginning as a merely consultative body, eventually assumed more responsible and decisive powers. Thirdly, there were the two general assemblies of the people—the *comitia centuriata*—military in origin and under the influence of wealth; the *comitia tributa*, a democratic meeting of the whole body of citizens. The initial mischief of autocracy, which the institution of the kings had made in Roman life, was not got rid of by their dismissal, for a narrow oligarchy of old families succeeded them and retained in their hands all the offices of the State and continued to exclude from office all those who could not claim their privilege by blood. The same fault we shall find again nearly a thousand years later in the Italian cities with their half-foreign nobility and its exclusive rule.

But the "plebs," as those were called, whether poor or rich, who had no patrician lineage, were determined to secure for themselves some share in the government of the State, and in order to enforce this claim moved out to the Sacred Mount, now hardly more than a hillock, at the distance of a short afternoon's walk from Rome. There encamped, they determined not to return till their rights were acknowledged. The famous *Parable*

of the Belly and its Members was the only weapon used by the patricians to induce the plebeians to return. By it they also gracefully admitted their own mistakes. On the strength of this "formula," which apparently satisfied the honour of each side, the plebeians returned to Rome and were granted two new offices called "tribunes of the people," (i) who could interfere to secure justice in any law case between a plebeian and patrician; (ii) who could try all cases in which plebeians only were concerned; and (iii) who could summon the plebeians to their meetings, which had power to pass laws.

However, the consulship was still left in the hands of the patricians, and in consequence the plebeians had no guarantee of justice, for the consuls were the supreme judges, and the law was not written, but traditional; it lay "in the bosom" of the judge, and therefore (as it seemed to the plebeians) could be always interpreted in favour of the patricians and against them. Eventually and by stages these wrongs were righted:

- 1st. By the promulgation of the Twelve Tables of the Law.
- 2nd. By conceding to the *Comitia tributa* the power to enact laws binding on the State.
- 3rd. By allowing an appeal in justice from the magistrates to the people as the supreme authority in the State.
- 4th. By granting the tribunes certain privileges against arrest.
- 5th. By enacting (the Licinian Law 367) that one consul must be, and both might be, plebeian.

Rome, for all its turbulence and even sometimes its fierce party-struggles, managed its internal politics with sufficient dignity and reasonableness so as to avoid violent revolutions and legacies of extreme bitterness. We notice this slow growth of widening democracy with a secret and sympathetic understanding; the Romans had not the theoretic power of the Greek to draw up abstract declarations of right, nor had they the explosive temperament that can only see in immediate violence the instrument to improvement. They were practical and good-tempered. This gave them a fundamental unity and prevented lasting political hatred in the ranks of the citizens. Perhaps this may have been due to the years of fighting; and also it may have

been because the Romans were thus a disciplined army, and a disciplined army is composed of men who never forget they have been comrades.

It was well for Rome that by 339 she had given citizenship to all her people and to her allied cities. Within a generation and a half (time enough, that is, for all those who fought against her to have died off and for their children to have been bred from infancy to consider themselves to be part-owners of Roman glory) Rome had to face a trial that demanded all her resources, namely, her first Punic War. We shall see, when this was over, Rome enlarging her empire to absorb all that the Phœnicians had conquered, then all that the Greeks had colonised, and at last all the territory that Alexander had touched and fought over. Thus did they become rulers of the known civilised world.

The first contacts between Rome and Carthage that we know of show Carthage limiting the trading freedom of Rome. This suggests that Rome as a commercial power was beginning to arouse the fear of Carthage. Polybius, the Roman historian, quotes two treaties between the cities, of which the second and latter treaty is more restricting than the first: Does this mean that Rome's power to make a better treaty had weakened in the interval, or only that Carthage had increased its fear of Rome? Rome by the first was forbidden to trade further west than the Fair Promontory, just north of Carthage; and by the second even Sardinia and Africa were forbidden her.

The actual occasion of the first war (264-241) was an appeal for help to Rome by Sicily, where Carthage had been warring for two hundred years before the Romans came. The city of Syracuse, which had nearly always managed to elude the Carthaginian forces and to hold out against conquest, called in Roman aid (264 B.C.), and was naturally delighted to have so fine an opportunity for paying back the harm which it had suffered at Carthaginian hands.

At first the campaign was successful for Rome, both in Sicily itself and also at sea. The sea victory was due—

(1st) To Roman persistence, for up till the war the Romans had no armed fleet. It was only because a Carthaginian ship

was wrecked on their shores that the Romans knew what a war-vessel really looked like and were able to build a fleet themselves.

(2nd) To Roman good sense, which limited it to attempting only the arts they knew.

Though they built a fleet, they never pretended to be anything else than soldiers. Deliberately the battles at sea were turned into land battles, so that the Phœnician seamanship should prove useless and the Roman short-sword have its chance. By means of boarding-bridges the Roman vessel clung to the Carthaginian vessel and calmly prevented it from manœuvring, and emptied its soldiers on to the other's deck. The sailors were at a disadvantage by this unaccustomed method of warfare. The Roman soldier defeated the Carthaginian sailor on the sea.

Thus the sea victory of Mylæ was due to the stolid refusal of the admiral Duilius to become anything else than a general. Rome gave him a romantic reward. He was ceremoniously thanked by the Senate and voted a torch-bearer and a flute-player to escort him home every night. Rome was not only a city with a sober respect for realities and a refusal to improvise more than was needed, but she had also evidently a humorous sense of economy and of the strength of the permanent desires of man. But this victory and her success in Sicily tempted Rome (256) to invade the African shore. Here she was outside her element, for her forces were too far from their base, and her troops were not as yet accustomed to fight in the African climate. The story of her defeat and captured general, Regulus, is a little epic as the Roman historians told it: his sense of honour after he had been sent to Rome to offer her terms of peace ending in an exhortation to the Senate rather to let him die in Africa than accept the proposed peace, and in his coming back to Carthage to suffer a death of cruelty. But the story shows also the honourable conduct of Carthage in trusting him to go back to Rome on such an embassy. However, the African expedition was only an episode in the war. In 242 Libyæ fell, and Sicily was evacuated by Carthage, and Rome remained there supreme. She had now definite dominions. Her empire had begun. Yet at first she

did not administer Sicily. She merely protected it and used it, but left it to administer itself.

After that adventure had been successfully ended, she crossed her own protecting hills and founded by conquest a subject Gaul, south of the Alps. This proved a weakness to her, because here she made no attempt to win the affections and unity of the people or to unite them to her. In the shock that followed, while the rest of Italy stood loyal to her, these Gauls naturally went over to the enemy. That shock was the Second Punic War (218-202), begun over the town of Saguntum, a Spanish town under Roman protection or in alliance with Rome. Saguntum was attacked by the victorious Hannibal, who was a subordinate general in the Carthaginian army that had conquered almost the whole of Spain. Livy, the Roman historian, has a marvellously dramatic account of the appeal of Saguntum to Rome, of the Senate's hesitancy, of the fear amongst some of the Romans lest the Senate should throw over its pledge of honour, of the visit of the Roman ambassadors, and of Carthage's declaration of war.

Thus began the war in which two things emerged, the generalship of Hannibal and the heroism of Rome. Livy as a writer is at his best in his description of both. In a translation the story is fascinating; in the original it has the fine qualities of Greek drama—the suspense, the more than mortal contest, the huge stature to which human character can reach in conditions of crisis, the divine interposition, the swift counter-climax, the doom, the horror at the total destruction of so much greatness, the city of Carthage removed from the life of mankind. By an incredible march Hannibal crossed the Alps, breaking his way through the rocks by setting wood ablaze on them and pouring vinegar on the heated stone till it cracked. Once across into Rome's territory, he roused the restive Gauls, whom their forced subjection had left bitter and fretful, swept over the Apennines and came within the protecting curve of Rome's own hills; he slipped past one Roman army, came unexpectedly on another at Lake Trasimene (217) and destroyed it, with its consul, and then marched westward through a gap in the hills. Here he waited till the Romans had raised their maximum force, de-

feated it at Cannae (216) with unbelievable slaughter, and had the great plain between the Apennines to Capua open to his mercy. For some reason, at Capua he waited again before he marched on Rome:

(i) But the central cities of Italy never wavered in their loyalty to Rome.

(ii) The tactics of Fabius the Cunctator never to attack but to follow, harass and retire, wore down the initiative of the invaders.

(iii) The jealous merchants at Carthage never gave Hannibal due support.

(iv) Scipio, later to be known for this as Scipio Africanus, ventured on the supreme act of defence, on an invasion of Carthage herself.

This so scared the Carthaginian civil population that Hannibal was summoned home, as Scipio had foreseen. The two generals met at Zama in 202. It was Scipio's battle; Carthage surrendered; Rome's crisis was passed.

There was no one in the west or south now to oppose her. She picked up one by one the conquests of her foe. Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Spain were now made provinces. Carthage was disdainfully left a certain independence for another fifty years.

But in the Carthaginian army at Zama were Macedonian soldiers, for King Philip V of Macedon was in alliance with Carthage; this led to an entanglement of Rome with the East for, once she had appeared against Macedon, in every Eastern quarrel the weaker disputant appealed to Rome for justice. Rome found herself the arbitrator of the East.

197 at Cynoscephalæ she defeated Macedon.

190 at Magnesia she defeated Antiochus of Syria.

168 at Pydna the Achæan League was encountered with its allies and defeated, and finally conquered in 146.

During this period Rome was brought into direct contact with Greece, first as its defender, secondly as its stern pacificator. At first Greece even became the fashion in Rome. The old Roman virtues were not forgotten, but denounced as uncouth and clumsy, its frugalities despised. Greek culture and ideals began

to sweep over Rome and its higher classes. This went on even after Rome had discovered that the Greeks resented her protection, finding that Roman arbitration ended in Roman interference. Yet even when the Greeks rebelled, Greek art still was popular in Rome. Indeed, from this time onward Roman art, the native art, disappears. Just as the old Anglo-Saxon literature ceased to influence our language after Chaucer had broken its continuity by building English prose and poetry on Italy and France, so between the Roman literature that we all know or know of and the earlier Republican literature there is no relationship.* Greek culture separated the two styles and gave a new model to Rome. This roused the fury of the older school, who looked on these new-fangled ways as effeminate and unworthy of the traditions of Roman heroism. But, curiously, they traced the evil to Carthage rather than Greece. They considered that the conquered wealth of Carthage and its love of money were corrupting the Roman spirit and making it imitate the weakening luxury of the East. Cato was the leader of these stern puritans, and his political remedy was the destruction of Carthage: *Delenda est Carthago*. He flung fresh grapes from Carthage on the floor of the Senate house to prove how near it was to Rome, since fruit could be carried from it over sea and still be fresh when it reached Rome. This was to show how close to them lay this centre of disease; and also to frighten them into finding a menace in the nearness of this ever-possible rival. He won his point. In 146 Carthage was destroyed, its territory made into a province, the last formidable single opponent of Rome cleared away.

Notice in the Eastern campaigns:

(i) Rome never went east except at the invitation of a people in distress.

(ii) She always began by refusing to possess the territory of the people she conquered; she only warned off everyone else.

(iii) This "Monroe doctrine" always in the end led to occupation of the territory and its incorporation in her empire—which thus seemed to her to grow of itself.

* Refer to Mackail's *Latin Literature*.

(iv) Even the provinces thus occupied were considered to have Roman governors only to defend them; the old customs, religions, and even justice, were supposed to continue. Rome only defended, taxed for the local benefit, and gave in large measure the privileges of her nobler law.

Thus in her own eyes Rome "found herself possessed" of territories, and because of this possession (the result of no planned policy, but of unexpected necessity) discovered herself to have become an imperial city. Suddenly her most advanced politicians and statesmen realised that her organisation was inadequate to deal with these world problems. She was only a city. How could the rulers of a city administer an empire? A municipal council govern the world?

Every external development of Rome re-acted on the central government. It had to be altered to enable it to deal with the increase of work or the new type of administration or the sprawling provinces that grew, as it seemed, by accident out of appeals for help and local border forays. But the particular ways in which this expansion of Rome's dominion re-acted on her home condition can be reduced to three chief heads:

I. CONSTITUTIONAL.—(i) It will be remembered that the Consuls were not only the political heads of the State, but were also its military leaders and formed its supreme judicial court; once new provinces came under Roman rule, it was impossible for this system to be any longer practical, for the Consuls could not possibly lead the armies abroad, and at the same time be in supreme charge of the local Roman affairs and of Roman justice.

(ii) While the Consuls were thus distracted by increasingly diverse business the Senate had grown in power. Unlike the Consuls, it was always a continuous body; and it contained men (once Consuls and others) versed in the affairs of the army, politics and judicial business. Hence it was inevitable that the Senate should tend to absorb more and more the direction of Roman affairs.

(iii) But the people, scattered as traders and soldiers over the new provinces, and growing in the sense of the own im-

portance to the continued dominion of Rome, learnt to dispute with the Senate the rule of public affairs. The battle for mastery between Senate and people swayed now to one side and now to another. It was only ended by the establishment of the Emperors.

II. SOCIAL.—There were also at this time two factors working which are now recognised to have disturbed the social economy of Rome.

(i) The inclusion within the Roman State of great wheat producing areas—Sardinia, Corsica and Carthage, ruined the grain produce of Italy by cheapening the market.

(ii) The new slavery, developed from contact with the east, cruel and industrialised, drove free labour out of employment. Hence came failures amongst the small farmers and also the depression of the free classes in agricultural districts.

III. RELIGIOUS.—This was affected chiefly by the vogue for Greek ideas and by the wealth from the East.

(i) Roman puritanism was relaxed by the widening influence of Greek philosophy, which made the old discipline seem narrow and rigid.

(ii) Roman stoicism softened under the more naturalistic art of Greece.

(iii) Roman heroism, which was built on the notion of religion, seemed uncouth to the exquisite leaders of fashion schooled in the Eastern indolence.

As always, the touchstone of Western supremacy of order and unity was its success or failure in absorbing the East without being spoilt by it. The dislocation at home, produced by all these causes, led to a new social policy, which was championed by the two Gracchi: (i) first and most moderately by Tiberius Gracchus with his land-law of 133 B.C., the purpose of which was to settle the poor in small holdings on the public land of Rome, (ii) secondly and less conservatively, after the death of Tiberius in a riot, by his brother Caius (123), who added more radical clauses to his brother's land-law and developed a political programme, urging the people to take over the government

from the Senate, and through the various *comitiæ* to capture the supreme direction of affairs.

The man who, even more than either of the Gracchi, made the people for the moment supreme was, ominously, a returned victorious general, Marius, whose popularity with the citizens was due: (i) to his plebeian descent, and (ii) to his success in the Numidian wars (112-106). Moreover, he had been given the chief command in Numidia against the wish of the Senate, who only managed to secure that he should also have as his second in command Sulla, a patrician.

It is not necessary to go into the political quarrel that this command produced; but the success of Marius—

(i) Saved Rome from the inroad of the Teutons in 102, and from the Cimbri 101.

(ii) Threw open the highest posts in the army to all freemen for the first time, with the increasing prospect of plunder.

(iii) Led to the gift of full citizenship to all free Italians.

(iv) Ended in a civil war between the people and the Senate, in which Marius represented the democracy of Rome and Sulla the aristocracy.

But the memory of the struggle that most survived was not so much a war of political principles, as the introduction by both sides of (i) the practice of prescribing and legally murdering political opponents, (ii) the growing force of the army in compelling political decisions, and (iii) the inflation of the civil service, i.e., of a very large class whose employment depended on the good-will of the politicians.

While Marius and Sulla were quarrelling, in the confusion that followed two other generals were achieving greatness, Pompey in the East, capturing Asia Minor, Armenia and Syria (62), and Julius Cæsar in the North, overwhelming the Swiss, the Germans and the Gauls (52) and invading Britain (55-54). Thus, after the civil war was over, by the elimination of both Marius and Sulla, when Pompey returned from the East, after destroying the pirates who had been preying on the commerce of Rome, he found himself without a rival. He could have made himself the military dictator of the city. But he was no politician,

and made no attempt to disturb the peace of State, patiently waiting to be offered the supreme place which Marius and Sulla had held in turn. Finding him thus obedient to the law, the Senate, no longer afraid of him, ordered him to disband his troops. Even Cicero, who had just quelled the conspiracy of Catiline (a revolutionary outbreak of those who were determined to forestall the tyranny which everyone feared Pompey on his return might establish), made no overtures to him, favouring the policy of strengthening the Senate against the army in order to restrain the rising social democracy. Cæsar, who was in Rome at the time, an ambitious young politician as well as an experienced general and a popular orator, seeing Pompey in this discontented mood, chafing under the insolence, as it seemed to him, of the Senate, formed a partnership with him. Crassus, who, besides being an acknowledged success as a soldier and a politician, was famous for his vast wealth, threw in his lot with the other two. First a consulship was secured for Cæsar, who was pledged to use it to forward the ambitions of his fellows. A division of power was then made between them. Pompey was to remain in Rome, Crassus to command in the war against the Parthians, Cæsar to have command in Gaul, 60 B.C. In 53 Crassus was killed in battle; meanwhile, Pompey remaining in Rome, had no new military glory to give him popularity or prestige; Cæsar, however, was now in a supreme position by his victories and political achievements in Gaul and Britain, and by his popularity with the army, which had risen to be a perfect instrument of his will under his nine years of continued campaigning. Pompey was now afraid of his partner, and joined with the Senate, co-ordinating, against his return, a united front of the aristocracy, of Pompey's own veterans and of the moneyed classes. These decided that Cæsar was to be treated as Pompey had been, and commanded to disband his forces. After some hesitation, however, in January 49 Cæsar crossed the Rubicon and invaded Italy. In 48 Pompey was killed at Pharsalia. A new epoch in the history of the world had begun, for this coming of Cæsar gave Rome a new form of government; it inaugurated the Empire.

It is well to note, however, as regards the previous political history, that though there were discussions between the patricians and plebeians, and later between the aristocratic element of the Senate and the democracy or popular party, and later again between personal rivals, like Marius and Sulla, there were never any real party politics in Rome for

(i) there were never any elections in Rome, except for judgeships and the executive of government. There were no elections to the legislative bodies;

(ii) the agricultural character of the Roman territories prevented labour quarrels or tariff disputes.

Hence Cæsar, when he came to rule, had no rival political party to face, but he had against him the old republicans and the discontented revolutionaries, who ultimately joined forces to assassinate him. However, before that happened, he had

(i) Enlarged the numbers of the Senate.

(ii) Organised most effectively the government of the city.

(iii) Improved the pro-consular government of the provinces.

He refused the royal symbols, out of deference to his followers, but retained all power in his own hands. His rule, however, only lasted four years; after the confusion of his murder (44 B.C.), a second Triumvirate was formed of Anthony, Lepidus and Gaius Octavius, great nephew of Julius Cæsar. It was the same story as before; Lepidus dropped out, and the old soldier and the young statesman were rivals for the supreme rule of Rome. But the rôles were reversed, in that Anthony, the soldier, went off to a far province and lost popularity, while Octavius Cæsar, the statesman, remained and strengthened his position at Rome. When the final breach arrived, Egypt proved Anthony's ruin; the East was again the touchstone of Roman greatness. Measured by his capacity to deal with Egypt, Anthony failed. Cleopatra, no Egyptian herself, played the destructive part of Egypt; and at the battle of Actium in 31 B.C. Anthony was defeated, fled, and committed suicide, followed by Cleopatra in the story which Shakespeare tells with sufficient accuracy.

Then began the AUGUSTAN AGE, the rule of Octavius Cæsar

under the title of Augustus from 31 B.C. to 14 B.C., a title deliberately chosen because it was not political, but religious. The old official style remained, *SENATUS POPULUSQUE ROMANUS*; the eagles still were the standards of war; the name *RESPUBLICA* (or the Public Thing) was continued. But these were only forms behind which Augustus held all power, transferring everything to himself, even when he seemed most to give it to the Senate; for he retained the control of the army, and the army gave him control of the Roman world. His achievement was—

- A. THE ROMAN PEACE.
- B. THE ROMAN UNITY of law, transit and language.
- C. THE ROMAN EMPIRE, its boundaries now the Rhine, the Danube, the Black Sea and the Euphrates.

These three rested on a military basis, but Augustus had no desire to leave it to mere brute force, and he worked to establish a reverence for law by inaugurating a religious revival (assuming divine honours to himself as a symbol of the empire and of public order) and a love of literature and the arts. Roman literature had, however, a very brief existence; almost a hundred years covers it, and its names (as compared with Greek and still more French, or English literature) are scanty enough. From the days of Cicero to the end of the days of Augustus is almost its whole span. Literature under Augustus was deliberately inspired with a patriotic devotion to Rome. Virgil is the most perfect example of this in the epic of the *Æneid*, its legend, its incidents, and the historic pageant of Book VI.*

Not much more need be remembered than the names of the succeeding emperors, Tiberius (14-37), Caligula (37-41), Claudius (41-54), and Nero (54-68); the accusation of cruelty and even of madness has been made against each of them, but in the case of Nero there was inefficiency and insolence as well. The last antagonised the army, which still controlled the empire, but itself had slipped from the Emperor's control. In a panic at the threats of his soldiers, Nero fled and committed suicide.

There followed within two years (68-69) a number of emperors

* *Art in Ancient Rome* by Eugénie Strong, 2 vols.

set up and deposed by the army—Galba, Otho, Vitellius and Vespasian. But it is noticeable that it is no longer a united army that controls the empire, but rival armies, the Pretorian Guard, the legionaries of the German frontier, of Syria or of the Danube.

These were the opening rifts of the severance of Roman unity. But the influence of the next group of emperors, known as the Antonines, repaired the damage due to the lack of control by the central power over a far-flung State which the previous group had caused. The curious thing, however, is that most of these emperors now who restored the empire were not Romans of Rome, but of the provinces. Vespasian (69-79) was an Italian, so, too, of course, were his sons, Titus (79-81) and Domitian (81-96). Trajan (98-117) was a Spaniard, Hadrian (117-138), his nephew, also a Spaniard; Antoninus Pius (138-161) was from Nismes, and only Marcus Aurelius (161-180) of Rome.

Of external events these reigns can be remembered by the conquest of Judæa, the destruction of the Temple, the absorption of Dacia, and the pacification of the whole empire. These hundred and ten years (69-180) were years of quiet organisation; these emperors were on the whole just rulers, travelling through their dominions, and building up even more thoroughly than before the civil administration of the empire, developing the municipal government everywhere on a uniform plan. The prime difficulty remained that dated from Augustus, namely, that the emperor was still not recognised in the Constitution as holding an hereditary office. The empire was still officially a republic governed by a senate. Hence on the death of each emperor there was always the likelihood of a disputed succession for no son had any right to succeed. A family connexion or a legal adoption of a son had sometimes enabled an emperor in his lifetime to suggest his successor, but most of all force and political energy were the chief means of reaching the imperial throne. Yet precisely for these hundred years, each emperor did manage to choose and train a successor not related to him; this chance (though it seemed to have become a tradition) could hardly be a durable method of regulating the succession. But while it lasted, it did undoubtedly stabilise public order. Marcus Aurelius, the

philosopher and stoic, however, broke through this admirable system and bequeathed the empire to his son.

Despite Plato's desire that philosophers should be kings, the coincidence of philosophy and kingship has seldom been a success. Marcus Aurelius was no exception. He wrote admirable maxims, lived a life of respectable stoicism, persecuted Christianity, and broke up the peace of the empire by allowing himself to give the succession to his utterly worthless son. That son, Commodus, by his crimes and cruelties drove the army to re-introduce the custom of remedying bad rule by assassination; this evil remedy (that had followed the unhappy ending of Tiberius's reign and the insecurity of his successors till the Antonines) was again brought back, to weaken the empire till the advent of Diocletian in 284. To the century of peace of the Antonines followed therefore a century of confusion—under a series of leaders who fought their way to the throne. Septimius Severus (193-211), whose body lies at York under the railway line (where a signal box bearing his name is a hardly adequate memorial to the grave of a Roman emperor), was one of the best. Of African descent, his contribution to the imperial destiny was his encouragement of the army, increasing the pay of the soldiers, giving them certain privileges, and more than all encouraging them to settle, marry and possess property. He quartered the army on the empire.

Caracalla, his son, who succeeded him (211-217) is famous in legend for the grant of Roman citizenship which he made to all the freemen of the empire and also to his horse. The story is a valuable comment on the spirit in which the grant was made, typical also of the character of Caracalla. He was assassinated.

The two Syrian youths, Elagabalus (218-222) and Alexander Severus (222-235), who next followed, were also murdered; so too Aurelian (270-275), while Decius (249-251) and Valerian (254-259) were defeated in war, the former killed in battle against the Goths, the latter captured by the Persians.

Diocletian (285-305), a slave's son, alone restored the fortunes of the empire.

Before dealing with this last phase of the empire on the eve of its becoming vitalised by Christianity, it will be necessary to

notice a few of the results which these years of confusion, then of peace under the Antonines, and then of confusion again, had wrought.

We have already noticed the lack of a constitutional settlement of the succession to the empire. Though this had been temporarily remedied by the custom of the legal fiction of adopting sons under the Antonines, it had been broken down by the act of Marcus Aurelius.

To this must be added the following facts:

(i) The absolutism of the emperors tended to undermine the first qualities of a ruler, since this absolutism was not officially recognised, had no constitutional checks, and lacked tradition. It led ordinarily to regicide as the only remedy against bad government.

(ii) The emperors, except in a few instances, interfered in local governments and weakened the power of the provinces to defend themselves.

(iii) The tribes outside the empire were often taken over by imperial pay, and after service in the Roman armies were able to meet the Roman armies as equals in fight. At first they began to attack the nearer frontiers for the sake of plunder, conquest or mere love of fighting. The Rhine, Danube, Black Sea and Euphrates were still imperial boundaries, but at this later period were more often crossed with impunity by the barbarians than they had been. Not too much must be made of this point, for these forces of the barbarians were seldom more than raiding parties.

(iv) Financial distress became apparent as soon as a heavier taxation became necessary to meet the growing burdens of the extended civil service and the increase of expenditure on imperial defence.

(v) Scepticism was increasing as religion disappeared; scepticism in religion tends, no doubt, to tolerance, but also to inability to take great decisions, since the principles necessary to support those decisions are themselves in question. Politics are always unstable in an age when the scepticism of the philo-

sophers has reached down to the general level of the community.

In such an age a soldier or a tyrant alone can restore order. Diocletian was both, a soldier with a wide vision and a tyrant whose absolutism was tempered with a rigid sense of justice.

His practical principles are easy to follow:

(i) He divided the empire into two separate executive portions, each with its emperor, and each emperor with two Cæsars under him; this meant a quadruple division. These double Cæsardoms in East and West were subdivided into dioceses, and these into provinces.

(ii) He restored to the emperorship every possible mark of pomp and honour, and grouped nobles round the throne in ordered hierarchy.

(iii) As far as possible he cut out the intervening officials between himself and his subjects, and tried to link up directly the local governments with the central. This entailed a double process—(a) he diminished the officials of the municipalities, and (b) turned them into, and therefore increased the number of, the State officials.

Like every other organising ruler, he fell foul of the Church of Christ. In his efforts to insist upon a rigid uniformity through the empire he found the Christian an awkward member in his general scheme. Other religions could accept the Roman official cult, especially the newly intensified cult of the emperor, and yet retain their private worship and shrines without disarranging the pattern of religious worship designed for the Roman world; but the Christians were not content to worship privately as they wished, at the price of worshipping publicly as the emperor wished. Hence the terrible Diocletian persecutions undertaken to strengthen public discipline, which all the while weakened the empire by antagonising some of the best citizens, and added an internal quarrel at the very time when there was the greatest need for peace at home. Apart from this, Diocletian was a just and strong emperor, and his work survived through Constantine to the medieval times.

After twenty years of empire he insisted on resigning, since he

had laid down as a principle when he drew up his constitution of the two emperors that no one should rule for more than twenty years

After resigning in 305 he lived on in retirement till 313, long enough to see the victory of Constantine.

Before the reign of Constantine is described, it is well to notice these social facts which affected life to the end of the Middle Ages, and link up the conditions of feudalism with the imperial tradition. By the legislation of Diocletian:

(i) The *coloni* or soldiers quartered on public land were forbidden to leave the imperial estates on which they had been settled.

(ii) The poorer landholders were compelled by their poverty, due to their inability to make small holdings pay, to "commend" themselves to richer landholders.

(iii) The guildsmen of the towns were not allowed to leave their own craft for any other.

(iv) Prices were fixed, so that the wholesale price and retail price were to be identical.

(v) A maximum wage was fixed by law.

These measures show us (a) a dislocated economic market and (b) the determination of the government to stabilise it by force. Meanwhile the currency grew debased and the trade routes were broken by brigandage.

CHAPTER II

THE ROMAN LEGACY

THE year 306, the date of Constantine's accession, is one of the master dates of European history, and also the year 323, the date when he became sole master of the empire; a third date between these in his career is also capital in the history of the world (312), when in battle at the Milvian Bridge on the Tiber, a few miles outside Rome, he conquered his first opponent and believed that, before the battle, he had had a promise of victory in the vision of the Cross with its legend: *IN HOC SIGNO VINCES, IN THIS SIGN THOU SHALT CONQUER*.

Constantine was the son of Constantius, who, with Diocletian, had been Augustus or emperor; Diocletian had fixed twenty years as the length of time the Augustus was to rule, and so he had resigned office in 305; a year later Constantius died. There were thus vacancies in the offices of both the Augusti. Constantine (at the time of his father's death) was at York, and after some hesitation he accepted the proclamation of his soldiers, who raised him to the rank of Cæsar, and in the end he agreed even to accept the imperial title. Tradition, of no absolute value, has credited his mother, Helen, with British birth. But there seems to be no evidence of this; the name itself suggests a Greek or Eastern origin; and there is some evidence that she kept a wine-shop in Nish, where Constantine was born in 274.

In the life of this new Augustus it is necessary to remember these dates and facts:

(i) In 312, at the Milvian Bridge, he defeated Maxentius, who claimed to rule as Augustus in the West, and he conquered there under the banner of the Cross.

(ii) In 313 (curiously the year of Diocletian's death in

retirement) he issued an edict granting to the Christians complete religious toleration.

(iii) In 323 he defeated Licinius, who was then ruling in the East, so that he restored in fact the undivided unity of the Roman world, which had never in theory been severed.

(iv) In 325 under his auspices was gathered at Nice the first General Council of the Christian Church.

(v) In May 330 he transferred the capital of the empire from Rome to Constantinople.

These were all acts of momentous significance; it will be well, however, first to consider a little the empire as it then was, and the new world that Constantine's successive acts created.

First we should notice that Rome itself had ceased to be the military centre of the empire, since the menace of war lay always on the eastern frontier, namely—(1) the Danube, where the Goths and their fellows lay encamped, sometimes within and sometimes without her borders, and (2) the Euphrates, across which were the Persians (or Parthians), now re-organised as a religion as well as a nation under the Sassanid dynasty. A single ruler of the empire, who was to be in fact as well as name an imperator or commander-in-chief, could not afford to live in so remote a place as Rome; of all other possible centres Byzantium was the nearest to both threatened frontiers. Moreover, on three sides the city itself had only to be defended against attacks by sea and had therefore only a restricted land fortification to protect. But although Rome had been decaying as a centre of government, her provinces had developed strongly on lines of self-government.

BRITAIN A TYPICAL ROMAN PROVINCE

It will be more useful to take Britain as an example of what was happening everywhere. We have enough to warrant us in supposing that from the Roman Wall (that can still be traced almost continuously from near Newcastle-on-Tyne at its eastern, to near Carlisle on its western, end) to the Humber, the country was held by a Roman army, which was probably not recruited from Britain, but which certainly contained many Germanic

legionaries. On the other hand, we know that in the second century some legions recruited in Britain were serving across the Rhine. The permanent garrison holding the Wall is usually estimated at about 15,000 men, and the whole Roman army in Britain at about 50,000. These legionaries, under Septimius Severus (the emperor who died at York in 211), were allowed, as we have already stated, to marry, to possess property and to settle in permanent quarters. We have therefore to suppose that, while possibly some of the British recruits coming back at last from their wars over sea settled finally in their old homes, it is much more certain that the legionaries already stationed here preferred, when their time of service expired, to stay on where their property was and where perhaps they had married. Kipling's verse puts this vividly:

“Legate, I come to you in tears—My cohort ordered home!
I’ve served in Britain forty years. What should I do in
Rome?

Here is my heart, my soul, my mind—the only life I know.
I cannot leave it all behind. Command me not to go.”

The poem from which this is taken refers particularly to the withdrawal from Britain of 30,000 Roman soldiers under Maxentius in 303; but what is here described must have acted continuously all through the period of the Roman occupation of Britain, as the veterans completed their term of service. Moreover, the discovered remains of that Roman occupation which date from this period, show us that the British copied the customs of their rulers, but necessarily individualized them according to their needs and capacities and genius. The island therefore grew to possess a Roman culture, but with a character of its own. At Reading museum can be studied the remains of the old city of Silchester, once called Calleva Atrebatum. In the larger and smaller glass-cases to be seen in the various rooms are displayed, not only objects discovered on the site, but also drawings of the plan of the city, in so far as it can be recovered, and also plans of

the various types of houses in which Roman and British inhabitants lived. From all these* we can assert:

(i) That the type of some of these houses (ranges of chambers set round a square or courtyard, the fourth side being sometimes closed by a wall with an entrance-gateway in it from the street) is totally different from the type of domestic buildings of the same period in Italy and South Europe. The needs were different, not to protect from heat and light, but from cold, wet, and gloom.

(ii) That the Roman mosaics here, with rare exceptions, contain no materials imported from any foreign country.

(iii) That the use of olive oil, on account of its costliness, ordinarily gave place here to wax, one of the usual exports from Britain in Roman times. At Silchester have been found very few lamps, and these only small ones, as against numerous candlesticks of terra cotta and metal.

(iv) That the Castor ware found in various excavations (so called from the similar ware found on the site of the extensive Roman potteries on the Nene near Castor, in Northamptonshire), coloured usually a dull drab, has in its ornamentation all the appearance of a native art, influenced little by the Roman style.

(v) That Christianity was accepted more by the British than by the Romans, since no trace of it has been discovered in excavations of purely military stations.

(vi) That when the legions were finally recalled in 410 by the Emperor Honorius and the last of the official troops departed, we have no hint that this meant any change of government, military or civil; on the contrary, we have proof that Latin remained as a widespread language, that Roman law and Roman land-management continued, that the old titles survived, the Dux Brittonum whose command ranged from the Wall to the Humber, and the Count of the Saxon Shore, who commanded in the south from the Wash to the Isle of Wight.

(vii) With the old titles survived even into the Anglo-Saxon

**George Fox*,—Short Guide to the Sylchester Collection, 1905, Reading.

days the Roman tufa or plume of feathers on a spear, the wearing of the golden belt, and the dragon standard.

We have, then, in Britain a typical Roman province, drenched in Roman ways, customs, laws and military training, and yet preserving a character of its own which influenced and modified the Roman culture it had received, and which developed its old commercial life and brought it into closer relationship with the rest of the world.

In any Roman province at this time one of the units of agriculture was the *villa*, where the lord lived surrounded and waited on by his serfs. Over the working part of his establishment was the *villacus*, or bailiff (in the Gospel he is called the steward), who had charge of the slaves divided into gangs of ten. Also under his direction were the *coloni*, or freemen, who had leased their land from the lord and who paid for their lease a tribute in kind, and who lived in their homesteads apart, forming a little village of themselves.

The *villa*, or house, would either have been of the corridor type, a long veranda with the rooms running off it, or its rooms would have been grouped round a courtyard, as more serviceable in a country where cold and wet were the enemies to be feared. The foundations of the buildings were brick or stone, but the superstructure sometimes was merely of clay. Sometimes remains have been found of a type of house modelled as were the churches on the plan of the basilica, with a long nave of living-rooms and aisles, in which were housed on one side horses and on the other cows. Over the cows slept the women, over the horses, the men. Very much later the horses and cows were driven out into stables or sheds and a central fire lighted in the hall itself. In Roman times hypocausts, or heating chambers, under the floors, with flues running into the rooms or between the walls, were to be found everywhere. There would have been the usual storehouses, and each would have had its tutelary god with a small shrine.* The little village in which dwelt the *coloni*, or freemen, was also usually built on a regular plan. It was built on cross-roads, the *decumanus maximus* being the main street, and the

* The *lares* were the gods of the household, the *penates* of the storehouses.

cardo maximus crossing it at right angles. The houses with their strips of land at the back were connected with each other by cart tracks.

Some of the freemen would have been military colonists, deliberately settled on the land by Rome as part of her imperial emigration scheme; and some *agri occupatorii*, who were veterans with larger holdings, provided by the State with oxen and corn as well as land, and either co-operating with each other in common cultivation after the manner of the Celts, or singly, as was the Roman way; and some the *tributarii cultivatores*, namely the older inhabitants, carrying on their old ways under a chief or foreman, a State official who might, but need not, be chosen from their number.

Of course, as important as these country groups were the towns with their municipal organisations. From our knowledge of these towns we must suppose them to have had a general self-government through popular assemblies, with power to make their own laws. In Italy, in each town there were four elected magistrates, of whom two were judges and two administrators, and a city council of one hundred members. Life in these towns was easy, with very little taxation till quite the end of the empire, the city property being let out at a rent which covered the light running expenses of the municipality. Moreover, the rich men of the town gave their services unpaid and were munificent in their gifts to their town.

CONSTANTINE AND CHRISTIANITY

Lastly we must consider very briefly what that *Christianity** was like to which Constantine now gave its political freedom. We can take August 1st A.D. 64 as the most solemn date in the history of the new Christian Church, because it was the date whence began the definite focusing of Christian feeling upon Rome. Probably on that day and in that year St. Peter was martyred in the circus of Nero, on the site where now stands the famous Church of St. Peter on the Vatican hill. The belief of

* Funk's *Manual of Church History* (2 vols.) and Otten's *Manual of the History of Dogma* (2 vols) are recommended.

the Christian body is to be seen most simply in the Apostles' Creed. Beginning with belief in the Blessed Trinity, the Father, who is Creator, the Son, who is Redeemer through His incarnation and is true man as well as true God, the Holy Ghost, who is the sanctifier, the creed affirms the faith of the Christian in the Church, the mystic body of all the faithful, in the forgiveness of sin in and through the Church; in the ultimate restoration of man after death to his body; in the continuance of his future life through eternity. From the first, however, questions were asked and the answers debated concerning the meaning of these articles of faith. These had at last to be settled if the community of the faith was to be preserved; and though the settlement would not preserve all to the faith (for some would leave and set up for themselves) it would safeguard the main body. Hence it came to be realised that since there was need for some method of settling the points raised, Christ must have foreseen it and guaranteed His Church against it—have foreseen and prepared a remedy. Thus out of a growing need, yearly made more insistent, the full meaning of the commission of Christ to St. Peter was gradually perceived.

For the first years we have only the barest references to the organisation of the Christian body. But between 200 to 260 we are curiously rich in information; then from 260 to 310 we again are left practically with nothing at all to help us piece out the story, but from the fourth century onwards we have a very great deal of information. But what we lack at present and what we greatly need are letters of the popes. We have none from Pope Melchiades (310-314), during whose pontificate the Christians began to come up from the catacombs; none from Pope Sylvester (314-335), whose relations with Constantine must have been close, and whose words would be particularly interesting to us; we have one from Pope Julius I (337-352); a few of Pope Liberius (352-366); and only a few again out of the vast correspondence of Pope Damasus (366-384). From that time onwards we have a very full register of papal letters, especially from the great popes, Leo I (440-461) and Gregory I (590-604). The result of this has been that historians, judging only by the material

at hand, have given to these whose letters have survived, an exaggerated place in the organisation of the papacy, and have even credited the papacy to their personal account. But more learned scholars have now very carefully sifted the documents, and from them have reconstructed the earlier papacy in action.*

From this we can conclude—

(i) That whenever there was any dispute concerning doctrine, the pope was either invoked to settle the matter or took action of his own initiative.

(ii) That in matters of discipline there was no uniformity in the way either of referring questions to the pope for settlement or of accepting his decisions, for Canon law was slow in forming.

(a) In Italy, Sardinia, Corsica, and Sicily the bishops were confirmed in their elections by the pope and consecrated by him; in the north of Italy Milan exercised primatial rights, while Gaul and Spain were divided into many provinces, each under its own archbishop. These all formed part of the patriarchate of the West. They were governed by papal decretals or constitutions, chiefly the answers of the popes to questions put to them by the bishops. These decisions of the popes are the beginnings of Canon Law.

(b) North Africa had no patriarchate of its own (except, of course, the patriarchate of Alexandria, and that only over the extreme east of it), largely because Rome was too near and too much loved. It developed through its Councils a disciplinary code of its own, but it was anxious always to retain its Latin character.

(c) Greece, Macedonia, Dacia, Dardania and Eastern Illyricum were Eastern in rite and custom, but were part of the Roman patriarchate; later they were deliberately put by the Apostolic See under a vicar, the Bishop of Thessalonica, in order to prevent them becoming Westernised.

(d) In the East itself were the patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem (a suffragan of Cæsarea till 452, when it became a patriarchate, acknowledged as such by

*Dom John Chapman O.S.B. *Studies in the Early Papacy.*

Pope Leo I) and Constantinople. These were all considered independent of each other in matters of discipline, except in so far as discipline had been settled for them by any of the General Councils. However, though all accepted the precedence of Rome and all praised the faith of Rome, there were many quarrels between them over their mutual rights of precedence, due largely to the increased political prestige of Constantinople and its wealth and leadership.

In this we are dealing with very much later times now than the days of Constantine. We can conclude this brief account by stating the law of the empire promulgated (February 28th, 380) by the Emperor Theodosius (which Justinian, who ruled from 485 to 565, later again put at the head of his Codex), whereby all his subjects were to hold "the religion which the divine Apostle Peter delivered to the Romans and which is recognised by his having preserved it there till the present day; which is followed by the Pontiff Damasus and by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic correctness of faith." (Peter of Alexandria had lived in Rome for five years, and is therefore singled out in the East as having the model Roman faith.)

The history of the Church can only be followed here in so far as it is part of the general history of Europe.*

We have therefore here not only to consider the Church as already in the time of Constantine organised for doctrine under the papacy, but divided for purposes of discipline into patriarchates—Rome holding all the West and a good portion of the East; Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem (after 452) having their lesser areas of jurisdiction; and some other Churches, in the East especially, being exempt altogether from these patriarchates. So important was the question of jurisdiction considered that we find the first Council of the Church, as soon as Constantine had given it leave to discuss publicly its affairs, almost as busy over this as over doctrine. However, the real point to notice about the action of the Emperor in 313 was that for the first time an emperor dealt with religion not as a philosophy nor as a state-

*cf. Batiffol, *Le Siège Apostolique*, also his *Primitive Catholicism* and Duchesne's *Early History of the Christian Church*.

department, but definitely as a spiritual force. The only other examples hitherto in the history of the empire were the crazy Syrian emperor, Elegabalus, and his successor. These were really the only examples of real imperial religion in Rome. Else Rome's religion had been part of the organisation of the State.

Hitherto the difficulty of Rome had been the difficulty of a religious people in search of religion; the quiet and simple religion of the early Romans, agricultural and sustaining, satisfied them in their first beginnings, but as their intelligence became more developed and tended to be infected with that scepticism, which first acquaintance with Greek literature always brings to immature minds, they could no longer content themselves with the old mythologies and the older domestic deities. Hence we find an increasing desire on the part of the Romans to find some teaching to inspire them; it was to the East that they had always turned, for, with their marvellous power to absorb and adapt to their use the gifts of other nations, they considered that as the special gift of the East to them. Eastern religions alone had this particular quality in the world, that they were not as yet State religions nor entangled with the State. They were more accurately religions therefore than anything which could have been found in the West.

Moreover, the great Romans were always alive to this lack in their own worship; thus it was Marcus Aurelius, the philosopher and stoic, who reintroduced the worship of Isis which Augustus Cæsar had forbidden in Rome. With all its corruptions and even bestial sensualities, the Egyptian mysteries brought a sense of something higher than mere nature and something inspired which Roman religion singularly lacked.

At one time the worship of Mithra seemed to have stood a chance of holding the empire, chiefly because it was a cult intended especially for soldiers. It was a man's religion. Much of its teaching and worship is very obscure: but only in one instance in the several fragments that have been found of its temples and sculptures is there any reference to women. But it would have been impossible for a merely military religion to have held the whole empire and held it together, and have

given it the life-force which it was so slowly losing under "the inevitable effect of immoderate greatness."

Christianity was a divinely revealed religion and true, and therefore bound to prevail. But the value of the act of Constantine from the point of view of the world's history is that it enabled the practical genius of the Roman order to use the religious genius of the East to the saving of the empire and the reconquest of the barbarian. Never had the older Rome known what to do with the East. It either oppressed it or was corrupted by it. We shall see, as the history of Europe unfolds, the ready instinct with which the new Roman order in its religious character was able to absorb the East and all it had to bring. From Greece it was willing to take the fine gift of philosophy; but mystical teaching, religious life, prophetic visionaries and other gifts no less great, came to the Christian faith first in Egypt or in Palestine or Asia or on the North African shore. They were all welcomed and given a place in the development of Christian life. The most Roman of the popes, Damasus, Leo I, Gregory I, and Innocent III, were also the popes who best knew how to employ and develop that which the republic and the emperors before Constantine knew only how to fear or to destroy.

Indeed, looking back from the time of Constantine to the early days which the previous pages of this history have attempted to describe, the vastness of the influence of Rome in the world's history has been evident, and equally evident that the origin of that influence lay in Rome's superb power of organisation which combined strength of central command with tolerance of local custom. Out of this was born the unity of the empire—that is, of the whole Roman world.

This combination of strength and tolerance was the cause of the acceptance of Rome by the Powers beyond her border; it was the cause of the long continuance of that acceptance; the ultimate lack of it caused her long decay.

At the time of Constantine this unity of the empire was failing. It was now again to be re-established, and by the power of religion. Roman religion had suffered loss with the increase of Rome's dominion over the East in the days of the republic. It

could not be imposed on the foreigner, and so it had fallen (exactly as the municipal organisation of Rome had fallen), because it was a civic thing, too narrow for the wider responsibilities and racial differences which empire had brought. The tolerance of other faiths made little difference. Even to admit strange gods into the Pantheon was to accomplish a merely negative unity.

Elegabalus, with all his crudities and egoism, had seen the need of something to supply a force which the mere political genius of Rome was no longer able to effect. He had introduced a mystic and Eastern worship; but his effeminacy, fantastic notions and public immoralities disgusted the army. The army had revolted and murdered him.

Constantine, on the contrary, found to hand the Christian faith, which was not merely tribal nor civic, but world-wide, and which could therefore positively and inspiringly unite the Roman world. It was not without a sense of statecraft that he saw victory in the Cross. Of course, as we now see and as the Church then saw, its means and purposes are reversed. We now see that Christ was using the empire of Rome to achieve the victory of the Cross, to widen, strengthen and keep united the Church He had founded on earth. It will be found in European history—

(i) That only a united Europe can survive the attacks of barbarism, within and without.

(ii) That the only unity Europe can achieve for long is a religious unity.

(iii) That even when she has been overcome by fatigue, if she has had unity of religion she can recover herself.

(iv) That unless she has had the binding unity of religion in her moments of fatigue, she has temporally failed.

Further, we must remember that when Constantine came to the throne all the old forces that had held Rome together and made her the centre of the world had each of them just begun to fail:

1. The city-state had long since disappeared.
2. The free assemblies by which these city-states were governed had gone also. The elected officials had been dis-

placed by a civil service, already so greatly developed, improved, and enriched as to offer an attractive career for any one with moderate intelligence and a prudent character.

3. The people had surrendered their power to the emperor at the price of public pleasure—"bread and circuses."

4. The old Roman religion had also, despite its brief recovery under the Antonines, relapsed into a mere convention.

5. Even the philosophy that Rome had inherited from Greece was ceasing to influence men's minds, and perhaps never much had influenced their conduct.

With all this visible before him, Constantine saw in the teaching of Christ, with its note of sacrifice and its spirit of unselfishness, and its width of brotherhood, the remedy of God to the diseases of man. It could give supernaturally just what naturally the empire had lost. Yet what exactly Constantine did for religion in establishing the Christian Church can be easily exaggerated. He did not make the empire Christian; he did not even make Christianity the official religion of the empire; still less did he forbid, restrict, or proscribe the old worship of the gods. But what he did was to give Christianity its freedom; that is the only thing it was waiting for, its chance to convert the world. Secondly, he summoned the Council of Nicæa, the first general Council of the Church, to settle its own organisation in this new era of peace. Thirdly, at the Council he did explicitly state the Christian principle that it was not for the emperor but for the bishops to command in all matters of faith and doctrine, that he was there "not to judge, but to be judged."

His own personal life was neither edifying nor even Christian; he deferred baptism till he came to die, and then received it from the hands of Bishop Eusebius, whose orthodoxy as a Catholic was at the best uncertain. Thus it happened that the empire did not become officially Catholic until the days of Theodosius.

At Constantine's death (337) he divided the empire amongst his sons; but this division lasted only a very short time, for their quarrels, jealousies, and murders reduced these brother-legates under the emperor's will—to Constantius, who as the

sole survivor succeeded to the undiminished empire in 350. He succeeded, however, not only to the empire, but to the successive attacks now regularly made on it by the waves of the barbarians. He had his great river frontiers to maintain—the Rhine, the Danube and the Euphrates. On the Rhine his army was led by almost his sole surviving relation, Julian, who commanded it with skill and uniform success and kept the tribes on the farther side of the river. These tribes were perpetually asking imperial leave to settle within the borders of the empire, but, had permission been granted them to do this, it would have been followed most surely by rioting and plunder. So successful did Julian become, that under his leadership the army recovered its self-importance and determined to reassert its old and evil custom of proclaiming whom it would as emperor. Its argument was, that since Constantius had gone back to the bad old way of murder so as to clear the way for his sole succession to the empire, the army would also go back to its old way of removing emperors whom it disliked and no longer feared.

JULIAN

Julian therefore was proclaimed emperor (A.D. 361) and turned with his troops south to attack the new imperial city of Byzantium; Constantius, who was leading his own army on the Euphrates, turned west to its defence, but died before the deciding battle could be fought. By default, therefore, by proclamation, and by force of arms in 361 Julian became sole ruler of the Roman world.

To him Christianity seemed the embodiment, not of triumph, but of defeat. He had suffered in his family from the murders of the Christian Constantius, he had been as a boy placed under the tutorship of Bishop Eusebius and had rebelled against it, he had been continuously under the suspicion of the Emperor because of his nearness of blood to the throne, and he was by nature awkward and ill at ease in company. For a short while, during a difficult period of his life, he had stayed in Athens and had been for the first time in his life perfectly happy, with court forgotten, and free from the perpetual menace of imperial sus-

picion and the restraints imposed on him by the ill-understood teaching of Christ. With men of his own age and the congenial study of philosophy, he was able to let himself be natural and at home. He was soothed by the exquisite presentation of paganism that he found there. It was after his stay at Athens and some further years of unhappiness, chafing under the close suspicion on the part of the emperor, that he found himself in command of an army and at last lord of the Roman world.

When then he became sole emperor he determined to restore the old paganism, which had been displaced by the new faith. It was indeed the old paganism that he tried to restore, not a new paganism of philosophy, but the old superstition with its sacrifices of cattle to the gods. He imitated the Christian religion of his time and showed his only respect for it by decreeing a paganism modelled on its organisation, with a supreme pastor, a hierarchy, and the ordered forms of religion. Mithras, to his soldier mind, was to be the substitute for Christ. But his god lacked reality, and there was no enthusiasm for this revival of what was dead. Talkative and breathless in his sentences, so that his public speeches were a torrent of words, punctuated with gasps, he failed to carry even Rome with him. After a rule of a year and eight months (360-361) during which he had devised all sorts of ways for plaguing, dethroning, and persecuting Christianity, he was called to the East to defend his Euphrates boundary; was victorious over the Persians in his first battle; was led by a Persian who betrayed him into an ambush in a wilderness, and his army destroyed. He did not die in the battle, but in his tent, so that the words which tradition asserts he had on his lips as he fell fighting were possibly never spoken: "Galilean, thou hast conquered." But though perhaps never spoken the words were true.

THEODOSIUS FINALLY ESTABLISHES CHRISTIANITY

After some years of weak and ineffective emperors, came Theodosius (378-395), who not only established Christianity as the official religion of the empire, but banned paganism from all governmental places. Moreover, when in 394 Christianity was

established as the only religion of Rome, the Christianity so established was not the Arianism* that Constantius and the emperors immediately after Julian had patronised, but the orthodox Catholic religion which has ever since ruled in Rome. It is this Catholic religion which becomes now and for many generations the touchstone of political stability. It is curious to note, but it is undeniable, that every wave of invasion that now broke over the empire survived only when it was Catholic and failed when it was Arian. Just as the imperial line between Julian and Theodosius wavered in its several divisions and diverse courts, and counted sometimes as many as three emperors at once of an undivided empire, and yet only survived in its Catholic and orthodox line, so only these barbarous races retained a place in the new empire that was being reborn, which were Catholic and orthodox. The "divine Apostle Peter" becomes to the visible eye of the watcher of these conflicts the shepherd of the nations. He binds and looses civilisations. He gathers and scatters. He slays and he makes alive.

DECAY OF THE EMPIRE

But before giving these several invasions in turn it will be necessary to note beforehand that almost every one of the invaders was already, before he crossed the borders of the empire, in touch with Roman things, had no hostility to the idea of becoming incorporated in the empire, was even willing to accept Roman titles, nor lacked reverence for the greatness of Rome.

Secondly, when we ask what made this new Rome so vulnerable to attack, we can answer that many lesser causes had contributed to this weakening of Rome:

1. Rome had expanded too widely to be properly defended without an immense army.

2. The Eastern racial elements never became sturdy soldiers, and had therefore to be defended by the rest of the empire.

The East accepted, but would not fight for, the imperial ideal.

*Arius taught that Christ was not God, but like God (*homoiousios* not *homoousios*); He could be worshipped, but was not from all eternity. The church saw in this a return to the old paganism, since such a belief reduced Christ to the level of the old heroes or demi-gods of paganism.

3. At the other end of the empire the Gauls never settled down to the Roman municipal system, but preferred to retain their tribal organisation, and were therefore always a source of weakness to the general body of the empire, though the war-like character of the tribes made them Rome's greatest strength.

4. Italy meanwhile had turned into mere grazing land, as the Roman conquests of the great wheat areas, Sicily, Egypt and even Britain, enabled corn to be brought in so cheaply as to impoverish by competition the Italian farmers.

5. The ruin of the farmers meant in turn the destruction of the smallholders, the increase of the great landlords with their *latifundia*, the buying up and leasing out to tenant farmers of the old yeoman farms.

6. Curiously, the price of slaves became so exorbitant that these yeoman farmers or *coloni* were never dispossessed, but remained on in an increasing and finally "customary" subjection to their lords.

7. The land itself became exhausted; the old rotation of the crops was abandoned out of ignorance or negligence; starvation threatened all at home.

8. Under poverty and the extravagance of the huge and unwieldy bureaucracy of the civil servants, the government, in order to meet its obligations, debased the currency, which hastened still more the general dislocation of commerce.

9. The old rich landlord class, which was now failing, was replaced by the new wealthy class of industrialists, who never troubled to give munificently to their city nor to carry on the work of their local civic government; hence more paid officials had to be recruited and the cities were now overtaxed to meet the new expense in running themselves.

10. Moreover, the town councils were now made financially responsible for the city's expenses; when the taxes failed to produce sufficient funds the council had to make good the deficit out of their own pockets. They refused and were compelled; with the result that no one of his own will would any longer serve on the councils.

11. The people grew so restless under the financial diffi-

culties and shifts of these latter emperors that a law was passed forbidding (a) the imperial tenants, and later (b) any tenants, to leave their holdings, and also forbidding the guildsmen to leave their guilds.

12. Scepticism in religion and philosophy had led to its inevitable results—(a) political indecision, (b) political inconsistency.

13. Because of their wealth the wealthy class were excused from work or responsibility; they grew to be incapable of both.

14. There remained the continual difficulty of providing for the succession to the emperors. There never had been any definite system except that of the Antonines and that proposed by Diocletian. Neither was enforced or continued. Every succession to the empire therefore entailed a civil war.

But when all these points are duly noted, it will be seen that they are not so much causes of the decay of the empire as symptoms of its enfeeblement. Even yet it was nowhere near its end; faltering and unstable, it endured in effect and in inspiration, and by a legal fiction, almost to our own time.

THE BARBARIAN INVADERS

We must now consider the various inroads made upon the empire by the new barbarian forces. These can be divided roughly into the Goths (376), the Vandals (429), the Huns (446-450), the Vandals again (455), the Germans (476), the Ostrogoths (489), and finally the Lombards (586):

A. *The Goths* were the tribes that lay across the Danube and the Rhine, and had long been one of the menaces of the empire on the north and north-west and north-east of Italy. They had, however, accepted Christianity, but from an Arian apostle Ulfilas (311-381), and this fact in the end prevented them from maintaining the advantages which they had whilst they held commands in the empire. Almost immediately after their conversion they were attacked and defeated by a foe more fierce than themselves, the Huns, so that in 376 they asked leave to cross the Danube and enter the Roman territory. At first permitted and then refused, they eventually joined battle with

the Romans, and by the successful use of their new cavalry ultimately destroyed the imperial army sent against them, leaving the Eastern emperor (Valens) dead on the field at Adrianople in 378. But despite their attack on the imperial troops, they desired to become Romans themselves. Theodosius (378-395), who succeeded Valens as emperor, with true statesmanship agreed to their remaining in the empire, settled land on them in Thrace, exempted them from taxation, and enrolled 40,000 of them in the armies of Rome.

They might have remained thus in quiet and gradually become part of the fabric of Christendom, but for three things:

(i) The death of Theodosius in 395 again split the empire into two, Arcadius ruling in Constantinople and Honorius in Italy.

(ii) The Gothic leader Alaric (King of the Visigoths or Western Goths, 395-410) quarrelled first with Arcadius and then with Honorius, and was only kept from invading Italy by the military genius of the imperial commander Stilicho, himself of Gothic race.

(iii) The victories of Stilicho preserved Honorius, but made him jealous of his defender, who was also his father-in-law. In 408 Stilicho was murdered by order of the emperor, who had now retired to the swamps of Ravenna and made there his new capital of the West. Relieved, therefore, of the opposition of the only general who could have prevented his approach, Alaric at once came down from his province of Illyricum, where he ruled as the imperial commander, to besiege the city of Rome. The Gothic troops, which had followed Stilicho, deserted to him and made his success inevitable. Twice he withdrew from his assault on Rome on terms on both occasions accepted but on neither fulfilled; so in 410 he returned for the third time to the city, entered it in force and sacked it. This was the first time Rome had ever been sacked since the Gauls had entered it 390 B.C. It seemed to St. Jerome, who heard the rumour of it in his cell far off in the Holy Land, that the end of the world had come: "What remains when Rome perishes?" he quoted from Virgil. He saw in the portent the break up of civilisation.

But the same year saw Alaric move south out of Rome with all his forces; by the year's end the city had recovered and Alaric was dead. To save Rome, if it yet might be, Honorius in that very year, 410, had withdrawn the last legions from Britain. Thus Alaric had indirectly relieved the Britons from any forcible connection with the Roman Empire; but, like himself, they preferred to remain within it and to call themselves Romans still.

Alaric's brother now married Galla Placidia, half-sister of Honorius, whose features can still be discerned in the splendid mosaics of Ravenna, with which her munificence and piety adorned the church she built, and in the exquisite ivory diptych preserved in the cathedral of Monza. By agreement with the emperor his people were given Spain as their new kingdom, and there for a while they settled; but they could not settle for long anywhere, even in their new territory. They were restless and ill at ease in the Roman culture, for they were Arians still.

B. *The Vandals*, who were also Gothic in blood and had preceded the Visigoths in Spain, had been invited into Africa by the imperial ruler of North Africa, Count Boniface, to help him in his quarrel with his emperor. Under Genseric they eagerly accepted the invitation, but proceeded to enter Africa, not as allies of Count Boniface, but to loot for themselves. They destroyed everywhere they could, both the commercial greatness of that richest portion of the empire and the Catholic name, for, like the other Goths, they were Arians and hostile to the faith of Rome. It was while his city of Hippo was still under siege from the Vandals (430) that St. Augustine died; but he was not wholly spared the sight of that ravaging of Africa from which the province was never to recover, and from which our language has taken the name of the horde as wanton destroyers. But the Vandals could only destroy, and not build. It was fated that only those who accepted the faith of the Papacy were to renew in Europe the old unity of life and culture. Apart from her was no stability and no endurance. Upon her alone now descended the "eternal" heritage of the West and East.

C. *The Huns*, who had pushed the Goths across the Danube and who lay encamped across the whole northern frontier of the

empire, even as far south as the Black Sea, headed by Attila, in 445, crossed that southern frontier and ravaged the provinces up to the walls of Constantinople, as Alaric had done half a century earlier. The policy of Theodosius to the Goths was now applied to him; Attila was offered lands for his people and a partnership in the empire. Like Alaric, again, he accepted the bargain and then turned on the Western emperor, crossing the Rhine and invading Gaul. Here he was met at Chalons in June 450, and defeated by the Roman armies under Ætius, the only Italian general since the days of Theodosius to be successful against the rebel invaders, and by Theodoric the Visigothic king, who came up from his Gallic and Spanish territories to defend the Roman State. Attila was indeed defeated at Chalons, but not so decisively as to prevent his returning again in 450 and entering Italy and penetrating as far south as Milan. This he captured, and then when Rome lay open to him he turned north again at the request of the Pope Leo I, and crossing the Danube, was found dead in bed in 453.

D. *The Vandals* then having destroyed all they could find in Africa came over in ships from the old site of Carthage to ravage the territories of Rome. Again, as against Alaric, and for the same reason, imperial troops were helpless against the invaders. The one capable commander, Ætius, had been murdered in 455 by the orders of the Emperor Valentinian, who, like his predecessor, Honorius, had become afraid of the successful leader of his troops. With no one to forbid them, Genseric and his Vandals therefore besieged Rome from the Tiber, entered and sacked the city (455), sparing only the buildings at the intercession of the Pope. After a fortnight, laden with booty, he sailed back again to Carthage. Was Hannibal avenged?

E. *The Germans* under Odoacer were the next (476) to come to Rome; though it is necessary to remember that these did not consider themselves foreigners, but imperial troops with imperial traditions, not trying to destroy an ideal, but merely on a quest for loot. Actually Odoacer overwhelmed the imperial forces and destroyed the imperial line, except for Romulus, in contempt dubbed Augustulus, whose life he spared, only to send

the imperial insignia to the Emperor Zeno in Constantinople and to ask for the title of Patrician. Though at first refused the title by the emperor, he was subsequently granted it, and as Patrician (476-492) he carried on the government of the West, following the exact lines of the old imperial policy and adding nothing to the old system and the old rule. But his recognition as Patrician ended the Roman Empire of the West.

F. *The Ostrogoths* or the Eastern Goths, now under Theodoric, attacked Odoacer in 489 and overwhelmed him. In the Gothic manner, he was captured, invited to dinner and murdered. Theodoric speedily conquered Italy, settled his court at Ravenna, claimed one-third of the land for his own soldiers, gave peace to the distressed cities, called in Boethius, the philosopher, Cassiodorus, the rhetorician, and others to establish a literary revival; but, an Arian, like all his race, quarrelled with the Pope and threw him into prison. His reign lasted from 489 to 526; but it produced no abiding result, for it was not a settled or established government, nor could be, since he was hostile to the faith of Rome. He demanded the return of the imperial insignia from Constantinople and was recognised as king by the Emperor Anastasius.

His death, however, was followed by the splendid revival of the empire of the East under Justinian, a revival that restored the Roman civilisation completely in law, in diplomacy, in commerce, in religion, and in war. Justinian (527-565) is the personification of that latent power of recovery of which Rome has always had a secret store. He succeeded as emperor in 527, the year after the death of Theodoric. Energetic (known in his time as "the emperor who never sleeps"), jealous, proud, indecisive, he continued the Roman tradition with a success that was greater than his character seemed to warrant. His first military efforts were against the Persians, who, with the Goths, had been the imperial enemies since the year 251, when the Emperor Decius was defeated and slain, and 260, when the Emperor Valerian was taken prisoner. He succeeded soon in establishing peace; only later to be faced with a long war with King Chosroes—from 540 to 560. Here he was fortunate in having as his

general Belisarius, whose swiftness of decision and of movement made him one of the greatest masters of the art of war. It will be remembered that the Macedonian phalanx with its long spear had been finally defeated by the Roman legion with its short sword in 197 B.C.; and again that the Gothic cavalry had displaced the hitherto invincible Roman infantry at the battle of Adrianople, in 378. Under Belisarius the mounted bowmen returned from the fabled antiquities of Greece to destroy the cavalry of the Goths. In 533 Belisarius invaded Africa and destroyed the Vandals; in 536 he captured Rome, and in 540 Ravenna, from the Ostrogoths, and in 554 he regained the southern parts of Spain. But Totila, who succeeded to Theodoric, reorganised the Ostrogoths against him and was able to recapture Rome in 549 and to hold all Italy against him except Ravenna. He beat Belisarius several times, only at last to succumb to Narses, another general from Constantinople, in 552, at Taginæ. After all this fighting the Ostrogoths had no further power of resistance; they left Italy, and disappear from the history of the world.

G. *The Lombards*, the last of the invaders, had also been in the imperial forces and had fought at Taginæ under Narses against the Ostrogoths. On the death of Justinian, in 565, they grew restive, and three years later, like the rest of the wandering tribes, invaded Italy. It took them a long time to capture the imperial organisation, but their ferocity, their persistence, and their eventual conversion in 591 to Catholicism under Agilulph (whose iron crown in the church at Monza is used at the coronation of the kings of Italy) combined to give them a permanence in Europe which their predecessors never had. They captured the north of Italy, including the valley of the Po and the broken territory of Tuscany, and they held the centre and a good deal of the south. They were Teutonic in origin and in speech. Their name was only a nickname given them by the Italians, the *Longo bardi* or long bearded ones. But it is the name by which history knows them. Their influence on Italy in peace and war, in art and government and geography is imperishable.

This wearisome story of invasions, with the brief interval of



the reign of Justinian—whose Codex of Law (529), whose Cathedral of S. Sophia in Constantinople (532-537), whose whole-hearted devotion to religion, and whose military success ensured for many centuries the permanence of Eastern Christendom—naturally made the life of the West as far as Italy was concerned hopelessly unstable. Endless war and the ravages of the pirates dislocated trade and commerce, discouraged agriculture, and threw out of gear the normal municipal life of the cities.

MONASTICISM

Yet all the while in Italy the energies of the Church were busy, reconstructing the life of the people under conditions however

adverse. Though this part of the story of Europe must be studied in detail in Church history, allusion must here be made to it, because it enabled the West, even in the dreariest years, to hold a continuity of civilisation till from the further West (i.e. from Ireland) help returned to it. In the interval S. Benedict was strong enough in what he founded to make good the mischief wrought by the depredations of Goth, Vandal and Teuton. It was S. Benedict, who beginning when Odoacer was named Patrician and ending when Totila was re-organising the Ostrogoths (480-543), established that which was the means used by the Papacy to gather and re-unite the scattered memories and life of art and letters and all the apparatus of civilisation. The name of S. Benedict then, and the actions of his monks share a common glory in the history of culture with the names of S. Patrick, S. Columba, and their followers, till the age of Charlemagne (reborn of both) established finally the common political life and its fruits in art and letters of the Christian policy of Europe. Though S. Benedict's is the later of these two forces, we shall take him first.

The monastic system, as we have already stated, is but one instance of the way in which the Papacy was able to put the eastern ideals of religion to the service of the West, for it was in the deserts of Egypt that monasticism had begun—first as a collection of solitaries, then of monks living in community under the rule of S. Pachomius, and finally of monks more perfectly organised under the better drilled and more cultured inspiration of S. Basil. The ideal of monasticism, once propounded, was readily welcomed everywhere in Christendom. From the Thebaid it spread like wildfire round the shores of the Mediterranean. Immediately the whole East copied the ascetic practices of Egypt; immediately in Palestine, in Asia Minor, and along the N. African shore monasteries sprang up; almost simultaneously it was introduced into Greece and Spain, into the north of Italy, then Rome, and then spread northwards like a network over Gaul, Germany and the Celtic centres of Scotland, Wales and Ireland: and what had begun in the East not only spread to the

West, but was transformed and localised till it became a permanent feature of European culture.

S. Benedict is the father of Western monasticism,* and his particular form of it has especially endured. Its characteristics are prudence and gentleness, with peace and activity as its chief fruits. Prudence is the mark of *S. Benedict's* rule, perhaps because, having been a hermit himself and having realized the excesses to which solitary austerity can run, he had determined, after the example of *S. Basil*, to found a form of monasticism which he designed especially to prevent too much rigorism and yet energise man's natural self-indulgence to vigour and self-restraint.

The very change from hermit life to community life was itself a potent means to achieve this object of prudent severity; for a rule written for a community had to take into consideration its weaker members. Only that could be made obligatory which the normal unit could carry out. In this case, too, the character of the saint no doubt also affected the rule, for the stories that clustered round his name in the time of *S. Gregory the Great* (540-604) show him to have seemed to his contemporaries austere and exact, yet tender with the exquisite courtesy of Christ. His own idea in compiling his rule may have been to limit it to the fourteen monasteries he himself founded at Subiaco and its vicinity, and at Monte Cassino (530), but the very power and usefulness of the rule caused it to be taken up much more widely. When, therefore, the Lombards moved into South Italy, attacking and ravaging in every direction, the monks of the ruined Monte Cassino fled to Rome in 580 and were lodged by the Pope near the Lateran Basilica. This gave the rule a publicity which the solitude of Monte Cassino had not afforded it. Moreover, it established it in Papal favour; so that when the young Gregory (but late an official of the empire) converted his palace on the Cœlian hill to monastic uses and became a monk, it was the Benedictine form of it that he chose. From his palace, turned monastery (where, if tradition can be trusted, his chair

*Butler's *Benedictine Monachism* should be read.

still remains), he sent out S. Augustine to convert the Angles into angels, and began that affectionate intimacy between England and the sons of S. Benedict which even yet continues. When at the Imperial Conference of 1926 the prime ministers of the various dominions overseas were seeking some formula which should establish at once their unity in the Empire and their independence within it, it was in the words of the Benedictine constitution of 1907 that they drew up the statement of their relations, imitating the model of the Benedictine abbeys within the Benedictine Order, which are each autonomous and yet united under one rule and in loyalty to one leader.

The sending of S. Augustine to England was the happy occasion by which the Benedictine rule became known through Gaul as well as in Britain, for, at whatever monastery the detachment of monks halted, their customs and rule left a memory and tradition. It is only after this journey of S. Augustine that we find Benedictine monachism multiplying throughout the north of Europe. But this is rather a later development of the work of the monks and is more properly related to the court of Charlemagne and what had immediately preceded him. It is worth noticing.

(i) That at the date of S. Benedict's death (543), Italy, Spain, Gaul and parts of Britain had alone of the Roman empire of the West received the faith; but all the countries of the West were in effect to receive it at the hands of Benedictines.

(ii) That the example of the monks at their manual labour in the fields, fens and forests, gave to toil a new sanctity and dignity, and redeemed it from the disgrace which the wealthy classes of the later empire had judged it to be. Slavery had sunk to serfdom, and until the monks came manual labour was the badge of the unfree.

Quite as important as the Benedictines, even in the years that immediately followed the death of S. Benedict, were the Irish monks, who had come by other roads to the missionary career and the exaltation of human toil.

IRELAND—(a) *Early History*

Ireland itself had been outside the Roman orbit, though Agricola had seen its northern shores from Scotland, and Tacitus had recorded that its harbours were better known than those of Britain. Its most ancient history is still in part uncertain; who its primitive inhabitants were and the exact order of successive waves of invaders, are questions now being answered by a patient disentangling of the traditional stories of the bards. This is a work which is still proceeding. The inhabitants were chiefly Celtic in the later invasions, but all the traditions point to primitive non-Celtic groups who paid rent to their new conquerors for the use of their old land. The Irish were organised under chiefs or kings, who were elected from the royal family. These various septs or joint family groups were ranged into a hierarchy, over which, at least later, presided the high king. The law under which they lived did not by tradition come from any single law-giver, but was a collection of decisions of judges, gradually accumulated and called the Brehon law, unique in the west in being formed independently of Roman or Semitic law. One of the difficulties in trying to visualize the early social life of the Irish people, has been their custom of redistributing their property at stated intervals, but it is proved now that the land was the private property of the family group and was only redistributed within that group.

(b) *S. Patrick*

The great event in Irish history is the conversion of *S. Patrick* and his coming to Ireland to be its apostle, in 432. This has been in its effects one of the most important dates in history. *S. Patrick's* birthplace is in dispute; Scotland, Wales, Britain, Gaul are all in turn claimed for it, the claim of each seems to be disputed. It is certain, however, that he was sold as a slave into Ulster, that he escaped, that he heard in sleep the cry of the Irish calling him to come back to them, that he interpreted this to mean his call to their conversion, that he went to Lérins, and that he returned consecrated bishop, with the Irish people as his portion.

Note that S. Patrick, the patrician, as his name implies, gave the Irish not only their faith but the first contact with Rome. Of Rome they had never known the empire, they knew only the Papacy. The Rome they obeyed was never pagan, nor military; whatever they learnt of the Latin language or of Roman law they learnt through the senate and people of a Rome that was not imperial but Papal, shunned by Honorius the Emperor and defended by Leo the Pope.

S. Patrick's slave days in youth account for the lack of literary latinity in his authentic writings, but his monastic training later in life taught him familiarity with the Scriptures. From the Scriptures came his teaching and its potency. Once landed in Ireland his life was an apostolate of movement through Connaught, Ulster, and Munster; returning through Leinster to Ulster to die. Before he died he had laid the foundations of Irish Christianity, not only by means of his personal preaching, but by his supreme gift of courageous organisation. He selected his spiritual leaders from the leaders of the families—chiefs, bards and brehons—(though he chose his priests from the "base kins" as well as from the "free kins") and not merely gave them instruction in the faith, but committed to them the sacramental gifts by making them the bishops and priests. To a people organized in tuaths (an administrative unit; it was a territorial division and had its king, judges, etc.) he gave an organisation of Catholicism which ran parallel with their social life. The effect seems to have been an extraordinary success. He could not, of course, convert the whole people, and he had to suffer persecution in various ways, particularly it would seem in Leinster, but he had single-handed in his life-time so firmly established Roman Christianity that it was never to be called in question in Ireland. The Gothic heresies never touched his flock: Pelagianism only, a primitive reaction against S. Augustine's theory of grace, at one time, perhaps, affected them (chiefly because Pelagius (370-460) was certainly a Celt and even probably a British Celt). Else in faith and devotion the Irish followed the Roman faith.

The Celtic tonsure and date for celebrating Easter and also its Eucharistic rite were all different from those of Rome, and

even were curiously Eastern in character. But these were minor points of discipline and never affected the main attitude of the Irish to the Papacy, whence had come their faith.

(c) *Monasticism.*

By the seventh century (S. Patrick had died in 461 just before Theodoric was beginning his long reign in Italy) the bards were Christian and the people Christian too; no doubt in country places paganism still lingered, but it was a mere lingering, only of custom and not of settled belief. Belief in fairies and the banshee was to survive; but the Irish believed in them, not as emblems of an old religion, but as a simple explanation of the strangeness of the world to Celtic people who are always full of wonder at the sight of the earth, feeling they belong to some other country which no man yet has known. The sixth century is the beginning of the famous age of the scholars and the saints of Ireland, for it was the beginning of that Celtic monasticism which not only illumined Ireland, but was the means whereby the Irish missionary venture passed right beyond the borders of their island to influence the whole of Christendom. This monasticism may have risen spontaneously: but it is not unlikely that it was due to the instruction of S. Patrick, who knew the monasteries of Tours and Lérins and would certainly have valued the culture he had gained from both.

Lérins, which was to learn Benedictinism from S. Augustine of Canterbury, had as yet only the guidance of S. Honoratus, who established his monastery in 375, at a time when the other S. Augustine, of Hippo, still a Manichean, had not yet begun his own religious experiment in N. Africa with his learned band of young friends. Later on, this Irish monasticism was in turn influenced by the Welsh Saints, David, Gildas, and Cadoc, and eventually differed considerably from the monasticism of S. Patrick, and even ultimately modified the ecclesiastical organisation of S. Patrick (*Ireland*, Part I, by Rev. J. Ryan, S.J.).

It is evident that if S. Patrick were the real founder of Irish monasticism, he would undoubtedly have chosen as his type the monasticism of Lérins and Tours, which he knew; and it is this

type which we actually find in Ireland. Possibly he himself instituted a spiritual centre of training for his young and zealous converts in arts, human and divine; or perhaps beginning first as solitaries, these hermits soon gathered into monastic colonies for both traditions seem to have been handed down. We know that the number grew so rapidly that the chroniclers give us statistics which leave the reader gasping at the possibility even of a legend being so widely believed. But the consensus of these legends as to the vast number of the monks both in Ireland and in Wales is unanimous; the figures may be no more than wild guess-work, but they do stand for an astonishing popularity of the monastic form of life amongst the Celts. The chief names and dates to be remembered are—

S. Enda at Arran (480)

S. Finian at Clonard (530)

S. Kevin at Glendalough (about 544)

S. Kieran at Clonmacnoise (548)

S. Comgall at Bangor (552).

S. Brendan at Clonfert (555)

S. Carthach at Lismore (635)

Mention must also be made of S. Brigid (d. 523) of Leinster, who after curious vicissitudes founded her famous nunnery at Kildare, which was not only the centre of learning and piety, but the mother house of many more such centres.

The chief hero, however, of the post-patrician times was S. *Columba* (521-597), of royal birth and naturally ambitious. He saw in a well-led monasticism his chance to carry out the great designs which his talents suggested to him he could carry out for the service of God. One biographer says that he set out (563) "of his own free will and because of his boundless love of Christ"; and another old life says that he "abandoned his native land for the love and fervour of Christ." It was the same motive that was later to inspire S. Columbanus (d. 615) and the other Irish missionaries—sacrifice for the love of God.

His life has been written by S. Adamnan, a choice medieval biography, which is one of the Latin classics of that unclassical age. S. Columba's history in it, till the voyage to Scotland and

the settlement of the Saint at Iona, is only briefly touched on. But thence after we have the epic beginnings of his monastic establishment, to become famous as a great missionary centre, not only for the founding of the faith in Scotland and England, but also for the housing and spreading of learning all over the Continent. While the Goths and Vandals and Lombards were destroying all the external culture of Rome on the continent of Europe, S. Patrick had preserved a place of resting for it, sheltered from the destruction and devastation of the time. The unquenchable flame of Christian learning was carried for safety to Ireland, and there remained till it could be moved into England, and thence, through Alcuin (himself a student in both islands), to the court of Charlemagne, and from Charlemagne back at last to the Mediterranean sea.

Besides its schools of Latin and Greek at Iona, the island became famous for the terrible austerities of the monks, and these austerities undoubtedly attracted to Christianity the fierce Pictish tribes whom S. Columba tamed to Christ. Rome in her mightiest days had never been able to restrain them, but the restless Columba, with his sweetness, his unquenchable activity and his amazingly rigorous fasts, made them obey his laws.

Even after his death (597), in the very year that S. Augustine was to land in England, the spell of S. Columba lasted, and Iona gave an unceasing supply of missionaries, both of faith and culture. The *Book of Kells* was perhaps designed and carried out in a monastery under the jurisdiction of Iona; it may easily have formed part of that tradition of illumination in which S. Columba had himself been brought up, and in the art of which we know that he had himself excelled.

The life-work of S. Columba was a reversal of the old paganism and old hatred for Britain; for we shall find the conversion of its people to have been accomplished in the end by the descendants of the missionaries of Iona.

CLOVIS AND THE MEROVINGIANS

S. Benedict and S. Patrick (the forces that between them saved the Roman culture) were both strong supporters of the Papacy;

both formed a retreat for learning and sanctity; both were powers which ultimately re-established the Roman tradition in the troubled West. There was a third master mind to be added to these, and his name was Clovis. He became the king of the Franks in 481; it was a tribe of Germanic origin, but with Roman traditions, settled on both banks of the Rhine, on territory, that is, stretching from as far north as the sea down to Cologne. Clovis was king of the Salian Franks (for there were two branches of them—Salian and Ripuarian) who lived at the mouth of the river and made Tournai their capital. He fought his way up stream and conquered his kinsmen who lived higher up the river (491); but first he turned to the west and destroyed the last remnant of the old Romano-Gallic organisation, defended by Syagrius, whose power held both banks of the Seine. Syagrius fled to the Visigoths for protection, but was surrendered to Clovis and slain. By this victory (486) Clovis was assured of a strong base for striking, and he again turned, this time south. He met and overwhelmed the Visigoths (507) who still held the lower parts of France and the north of Spain, and who, under Theodoric, had saved Christendom at Chalons. Clovis, in his war with them, moved as far south as the Garonne, and then turning north-east to the upper Rhine, he attacked and routed the Alemanni (496). By this time he possessed a territory of considerable extent united under his own rule. He held the Rhine, the Seine and the Garonne; he added a fourth great river as a boundary by forming a marriage alliance with a Burgundian princess, Clotilde. He had now peace on all his borders. In 496, three years after S. Patrick's death, with three thousand of his men he became a Christian and was confirmed by the emperor in his possessions. He was baptized by S. Remigius on Christmas Day to the sound of monastic chants. "Sir," he asked of the bishop, as he passed through the ranks of the cowed monks, "is this heaven already?" "No," answered the Bishop, "but it is the road thereto." He had promised before his battle with the Alemanni to join the religion of his wife if he proved successful in his fight; he thus kept his promise and, as his Christianity was therefore Catholic and Roman, his kingdom endured.

In 524 and 534 his sons conquered Burgundy, in 535 Bavaria, in 536 Provence. This is the real beginning of the Merovingian dynasty, whose quarrels deferred for two hundred years the victorious achievements of the Franks. These quarrels arose because there were two branches of them: of these the Neustrian Franks on the channel seaboard retained the old Roman culture; the Austrasians, who straddled the Rhine, were never so civilized or so tamed. Their quarrels, tiresome, interminable and ferocious (the names of Brunehaut, Fredegunda and Chilperic suffice to remind us of them), lasted through the sixth century into the seventh. When Dagobert, the finest of the Merovingians (who was wise enough to follow the guidance of S. Eloi and S. Ouen), died in 638 and was buried in his now historic abbey of S. Denis, he left no worthy successor; but the mayors of the palace (chamberlains and ministers) took over the burden of ruling and established themselves in power. At last they ousted their sovereigns, but before this was done Pepin of Heristal, the mayor of the palace of the Austrasians, had defeated the Neustrians, and when he died in 714 he left to Charles Martel, his son, the office of chief minister to a sole monarch of all the Franks.

ART AND LETTERS

This ending of the Roman empire of the West showed it to be but a weak inheritor of the Roman tradition in literature and the arts. In law we have the names of Theodosius and Justinian as the founders of Codes; in great Christian literature, S. Ambrose (397), Prudentius the poet (410), S. Jerome (420), and S. Augustine (430)—the greatest of all the fathers—great as a saint, as a bishop, as a scholar, as a biblical critic, as a theologian, as a rhetorician, as a writer, as a man.* Later come Sidonius Apollinarius (487) and Boetius (524).

Of art, perhaps the greatest triumphs in original work are now to be found in mosaic. We have still at Ravenna the remains of the work of the date of Justinian, both in the churches of S. Vitale and that of S. Apollinare Nuovo; and in Salonica those in

*An interesting life of him by Louis Bertrand gives a vivid picture of the Saint.



the church of S. Demetrius; we have also the still hidden mosaics of S. Sophia. Earlier even are those in the church of S. Prudentiana in Rome, and, also in Rome, of S. Laurence outside-the-walls.

Again, besides mosaics we have the tablets and consular diptychs of ivory, the rough gold work and barbaric ornaments of worship and war. The treasury of the cathedral of Sens has a marvellously carved ivory baptismal font. In architecture we have the simple magnificence of the tomb of Theodoric, and of his palace in Ravenna at the end of our period; and at the beginning the great Constantinian churches in Rome, the baptistry of the Lateran, for instance, S. Paraxede, S. Sebastian and S. Agnese.

But though in all these there is at times great taste and great effect, there was on the whole a gradual decline of art, with a slight upward curve under Justinian, and a swift drop again. This period is the winter of Christian art, rough, uncouth and gross.

THE

ROMAN EMPIRE



NOTE.

THE following division of Chapters has been necessitated by the chronological succession of events; but a division that would make the Middle Ages more easily understood would be one that ignored chronology and treated them as one whole.

First, we should take the realm of *law*, the fundamental necessity for life in ordered society (pp. 183-185).

Secondly, we should consider the *philosophy* and supernatural beliefs of the period, realising how the world of action is ruled from the world of ideas. We could then see in this period its marvellous note of the ordered subjection of society to the supernatural which flowed from the perfect synthesis of life in scholastic philosophy reaching its zenith in S. Thomas Aquinas (pp. 185-6).

Thirdly, we should turn to *art and literature* as the expression of the age's philosophy and should find the concretisation of the medieval ideal in poetry, music, painting, sculpture, architecture, etc. (pp. 252-3).

Fourthly, its *education* would be seen to have led to the practical application of its philosophy and ideals to real life by means of the song school, the apprenticeship to the arts and crafts and the organisation of the universities (pp. 94, 115, 302).

Lastly, we should then understand, for instance, the overflow of medieval culture into action in the Crusades, the direct expression of the zeal which was the concomitant of its *love of God*. Though there were individual sinners and criminals in the Middle Ages, society itself was thus rightly ordered.

CHAPTER III

CHARLEMAGNE AND HIS HEIRS

THE next period of European history is the age of Charlemagne, full of recovery in culture and in religion; but it lies between two periods of confusion and darkness. Partly this darkness is due to our ignorance of the life of the time; partly, however, to the political disorder and disintegration of Europe.

We have already dealt with some of that disorder, but we have also to record now the emergence and growth of two forces which fronted each other through the rest of the Middle Ages, and between them contributed to the culture and religion we know—namely, the Papacy and the imperial idea. A third force was also now beginning, very soon reached the height of its expansion, lost its width of dominion, but retained steadily to our own time, much of its ancient power. This was Mohammedanism. These are the three forces that contend in Europe through the whole period of the Middle Ages, the Papacy, the Empire, the Mohammedan faith.

ST. GREGORY THE GREAT

The figure in the Papacy which most dominates these early Middle Ages is the figure of S. Gregory the Great (590-604). His is not a long pontificate; but his fourteen years of rule established the policy of the popes, and even more surely organised the piety of Christendom. A monk, though of patrician blood; an invalid, though intensely energetic; a contemplative, though restlessly active; a pope, though a temporal ruler, Gregory gathered up the threads of the Papal tradition and passed on that tradition to his successors, secure and serene. He came of an old Roman family that had been Christian for many generations; after the

Ostrogoth capture of Rome his family had taken refuge in Sicily. Then it returned to Rome, where he was born, probably about 530. In his boyhood he was duly educated for, and entered, there, the civil service, became a patrician, and held at one time the office of the prætorship of the city. This, however, he relinquished for the monastic life. He turned his family palace on the Cœlian into a monastery, but he was not left to the quietness of the cloister. The Pope employed him in various embassies, including one to Constantinople, where he held a position corresponding to that of Papal nuncio or delegate to the imperial court and to the bishops of that patriarchate. His success here and his outstanding qualities as a biblical scholar, an administrator, a preacher, and a statesman recommended him to the electors on the death of Pelagius II, in 590. That year, then, against his will, Gregory was elected Pope.

Rome had already recovered from the worst results of the various invasions and pillages; the Lombards, the last and the most lasting of the invaders, had just begun to pour down upon Italy. But already something of the old peaceful life of the country was being established. The only great change that was seen, as the period of the invasions was over, was the elimination of any representative of the emperor as an effective viceroy. The exarch in Ravenna was soon to leave even Ravenna to the mercy of the invaders and by his going to remove the sole imperial delegacy in Italy. By default of any other, Gregory alone could stand for the old ways of Rome. Stand by them he did. In every direction and with a versatility that was amazing in its success, he turned to protect, defend and guide the fortunes of Christendom.

His first work was the defence of his city against the Lombards. Without troops he could only defend his people by buying off the invaders (593); by a treaty with them which he signed himself as a sovereign might (592), he came to terms with them, hoping through the influence of the Catholic queen, Theodolinde, to turn them from Arians into Catholics. His tribune protected the inhabitants of Naples from tyranny; his commanders helped to organise the defence of Sardinia; his ships carried corn from Sicily twice each year to provide for the poor of Rome. He

favoured the *coloni* and enabled them to escape the custom of serfdom which was settling on them, as we have already described, from the poverty and the disarray into which agriculture had been thrown by various causes in Italy.

His attitude to the Eastern emperor was inflexible. He accepted the civil authority of the emperor; but he would not accept any interference of the emperor in his own spiritual jurisdiction. But using his title, "servant of the servants of God," he showed at once his humility and his steadfastness. Thus he repelled the law of the emperor which forbade soldiers to become monks. But when Maurice the Emperor was murdered, and Phocas, his murderer, took over the imperial government, Gregory (though at the moment ignorant of the deed of violence that had preceded his succession) was ready to receive him with the same honour, to acknowledge his civil authority and to admit into Rome the diptych which represented him as emperor. This was all part of his general policy of obedience to civil rule.

Towards the claims of the Byzantine patriarch he showed himself, on the contrary, to be a strong defender of the Roman prerogatives, though he refused for himself the title of "Universal bishop" in order to avoid any suggestion that he was the real bishop of each see in union with him and that the local bishop was merely his vicar. But neither would he allow the title to the patriarch, John the Faster; he persistently opposed his ambitions and finally defeated them by the aid of the new Emperor Phocas, who re-enacted the decree of Theodosius which Justinian had repeated, declaring it to be the law of the empire "that the See of Blessed Peter the Apostle should be the head of all Churches."

Towards Christendom he showed himself a great spiritual leader. His name is indissolubly linked in phraseology with the psalmody of the Western Church, though his exact work in composing or organising the chaunt cannot as yet be exactly determined. The name "Gregorian" plain song shows, however, that tradition recognises in him the master of the new modes of the West. Again, his sacramentary shows him to us as formulating the words and phrases of liturgy, rescuing from oblivion older rites, re-arranging them and creating new.

His apostolic zeal moved him to send out bands of missionaries. With the Lombards he had only slight successes; with the Anglo-Saxons his success was almost too swift to be lasting. But in this he went out on a new road. The British bishops, who refused to have lot or share in the work of the conversion of their conquerors, stood for a party in Christendom that looked upon the old empire as something sacred and linked with the Roman name, and consequently looked on these barbarians, from Frisia, Jutland or wherever it might be, as something unworthy of the Christian inheritance. S. Gregory, on the contrary, was not to be dismayed, nor would he allow any such limitation of the fellowship of Christ. It was not merely to the Roman, but to the outer barbarian as well, that the promises of Christ were made; Christ was the Saviour of the world.

To effect this widening of Christendom he despatched his monks to England.

The result of this we must describe a little later. But we have now to note briefly the political circumstances by which at this date the Papacy was forced publicly into a position of territorial sovereignty* and thereby opened a new age for the Church and Europe. On the one hand the invasions had done their destructive work, the wandering tribes who were so fond of using Roman titles and imagining themselves to be the heirs of Rome had, nevertheless, broken down the Roman system, and the far-off emperors in Constantinople were too weak to enforce their lordship, and too little interested even to support the presence of their representative; on the other side there was a visible unity in Christendom, but of the moral order, for the heresies were declining, Christendom was becoming organised on a uniform plan, the Latin language was widening and growing more supple. The full Middle Ages were being born. We have not yet finished with the empire, but we have already begun Europe.

With the literature of Europe before the revival under Charlemagne we must now very briefly deal.

*The "temporal sovereignty" of the pope may bear two separate meanings: that he is the subject of no other temporal sovereign or that he has temporal sovereignty over others. The first (temporal sovereignty) seems to be his by divine right; the second (territorial sovereignty) his by public convention.

LITERATURE

The sixth century is the greatest and most original of the earlier ages before we come to the full rebirth of culture, for it holds the great names of Boethius, Cassiodorus, Gregory of Tours, S. Gregory the Great and Fortunatus the poet. Of these, *Boethius* (480-524) is the finest writer and thinker, and perhaps is of the five the one who has most influenced the thought of Christendom. His *Consolation of Philosophy* has been translated by such different people as King Alfred, Notker of S. Gall, Jean de Meung (the author of "The Romance of the Rose"), Chaucer, and Queen Elizabeth. These names are no mean testimony to the wide variety of types amongst those who found indeed consolation where Boethius had shown it to lie. It is not a book of philosophy, still less is it a book for philosophers; but it is philosophy brought from the mind to the heart, brought from the schools to become a guide and friend. Aristotelian in temper, Boethius here adds as well the generous, rich thought of Plato; elsewhere a commentator on Aristotle, here he never mentions him; he saw, perhaps, a danger of the elaboration of logic which Aristotle has so nearly always occasioned, and here balanced it with a humanity which the later age of the schoolmen sorely lacked. Certainly it was Boethius who saved the Middle Ages from becoming merely speculative. Through his influence they were never wholly lost to the value of a wide comprehensiveness of things as well as thoughts, and so rich was his own vision of the world that he would not have been out of place in the Renaissance. He came at the dawn of the age of the schoolmen to be the solitary link between them and the older literature; he is that age at its best, for in reading him we are only conscious of the remote time in which he lived by the intrusion in his pages of curious Gothic names. Else he might be a classic author of Rome or an early Elizabethan; he has the nobility of the one and the full courtesy of the other.

Cassiodorus (c. 480-575) his friend, who survived him, is a much more sterile writer, bombastic in his style, dry in his method, determinedly a teacher in his dutiful purpose. His letters (like that famous letter of his, written in Theodoric's name

to Boethius to find a harper for Clovis, king of the Franks) are overladen with elaborate ornamentation. But his position was assured in the medieval world, since in his *Institutions of Divine and Human Study* he created its educational system. The Trivium and Quadrivium were his bequest to the schools. By them he is the father of the universities. He was a monk.

As he had already founded a monastery before he wrote his books on education his theories were the results of practice, and show us, no doubt, what was his personal experiment. His influence on the monastic movement in diverting it eventually to the support of literature and the arts was no doubt considerable. He was not a Benedictine, for he was a contemporary founder in the very days of S. Benedict; on this account, since he was outside the Benedictine line, his influence has been indirect, but it has been on that account no less productive. The historian of the period was Gregory of Tours (539-593), heavy, learned and thorough; fortunately he had seen too much in the events of his time to be wholly dull; when he is speaking of what he knows or has seen he is lively and vivid. In the stolid setting of his history gleam some choice gems of description that will always live in literature, for happily he was interested in people more than movements, and is the master of the anecdote. Also he lived through violent times and had come in contact with many of the figures, which, partly through his narrative, will never be lost in the shadows of history—Fredegund, Brunhild and Chilperic; even S. Remigius and Clovis were hardly so far before his time as not to stand out vividly in his story of them.

There are other writers, too, like Jordanes the Goth (550) and Gildas the Briton (d. 512) who have left us solid histories; but they have not the poise of historians, and at least in the case of Gildas, we find such wholesale generalisations and such exaggerations that it is not possible to tell how much of what he says is true. Isidore of Spain attempted to bring literature to the level of every reader, but he is rather an encyclopædist than a literary man; he first worked the quarry whence learned (and especially the unlearned) hewed the material for their commentaries and philosophies.

Isidore was partly of the seventh century (560-636); so, too, was Aldhelm of Malmesbury (d. 709) with his humour, his bombastic style and his rare liveliness; so, again, by his birth was S. Bede of Jarrow (672-755). He was, however, a glorious exception to his time in his earnest and accurate scholarship, his strength and firmness of historic judgment, his omnivorous reading, his steady acquirement of all learning, from the liberal arts to the classics and then from the classics to the Scriptures. He was the perfect instance of a man of gentle and unruffled character, able by sheer character to create a medium for his self-expression out of the Latin of his time. He has none of the bombast, none of the exaggeration, and none of the lumbering Latin of his period. Grammar he had studied, used and mastered. Without the sudden sallies of Gregory of Tours, he had yet a fine sense of vivid history and managed to make his figures live.

In *Ireland* we find a fine vernacular literature through all this period, but influenced by the Latin classics in a way that is unexpected in a people who never formed part of the Roman world till S. Patrick, by his faith, made them sharers in that tradition as well as the heirs of their own great culture. The Irish were ahead of the English in their Latin education, and continued their devotion to it when through the long period of wars it had lapsed in the rest of Christendom. Their isolation from invasion and their genius both helped them in this. Yet their native tradition of literature was strong enough to accept Latin models and not be crushed by them, to carry the new ideals without losing the spirit of its own vernacular. References scattered carelessly in their prose and verse show the acquaintance of their authors with the old Roman culture; but their prose and verse go their own wilful way, despite the knowledge of the rules and requisites laid down by the masters of the classic tongues.

Thus Irish verse, though now held not to have been influenced by Latin verse, is curiously more akin in structure to French verse than either English or German. The laws of prosody in Irish, for instance, are by coincidence like the Roman and have remained so; whereas in English almost at once accent displaced quantity as the measure of the rhythm. France and Ireland continued to follow the more ancient forms.

Irish prose, on the other hand, was frankly free from the classical tradition; it was sheer romance. The grammar is said to be difficult, the verb elaborately complicated, and the syntax severe and inflexible; but the sentences follow easily after each other and are not involved and cumbersome with that mosaic of construction which is so noticeable in Anglo-Saxon and still remains in German. Again in this, the analogy with French prose is very curious and remarkable.

But for all their simplicity of construction, the Irish writers weave into their stories characters and situations as grotesque and melancholy as the heads that crown the twisted spirals of their illuminated pages. The story itself was often a mere succession of adventures, barren of plot; but it is the decoration which makes the story attractive—the decoration which comes not only from purple passages deliberately inlaid, but from the obvious interest taken by the author in nature for nature's sake. The medieval writer was always happy if he could brocade his story with gay-coloured nature, with red roses, white lilies, green grass and yellow paths. But the Irish writer, far more than any other, was content with landscape, so enthusiastic in describing it that perhaps wisely he forgot all about the story he was telling (in which really he was evidently very little interested) and devoted himself entirely to his descriptions of the hills and valleys, the bees and the birds and the sea. Indeed, at times the story was a pretext only for decorative effect, as the Flight into Egypt is only a pretext for a sombre landscape in the paintings of Turner or Claude Lorraine.

Was this due to the Celtic nature? Was it the result of monastic influence? At home and abroad the Irish writers busied themselves by preference over the desolate regions of the world—any place where were to be found rocks, sands and waves.

But a third element in literature is to be found in the Irish verse and prose; not merely is there romance and a love of nature, but the common domestic things are treated with intimacy and dignity. Adamnan (d. 704), though he wrote in Iona, is of Donegal, and his Latin literature is pure Irish in its theme and treatment. His *Life of Columba* is a monument of romance, of

nature and of this dignified domestic intimacy. It is packed with fantastic wonders, which only seem to be not quite incredible because they are matched with exquisite touches of simplicity, so that his fairy island of Iona grows solid and real when the old white horse, that used to carry the milk-pails, comes to the dying saint Columba to say farewell.

Critics have seen in Irish verse and prose not only a kinship with the French literature of the time and later, but also with the Greek; it had, as Greek literature had, the same clean lines, the same simplicity and limpid clearness that to the impatient reader seem at first shallow, obvious and flat.

Welsh, on the other hand, is a good deal more ornamental, more complicated, more involved; there is more of evident art in it. It gives the impression of a deliberately involved arabesque. The verse is often sheer pattern—poetry, woven, returning on itself by arbitrary rules. No Welsh poet was compelled by the rules of his art to make his meaning intelligible; he was an impressionist, who was content to give mere glimpses of what he wanted to show. Often the mist of the valleys, more often the mist of the dawn, is described in Welsh literature: it is always luminous and yet it hides the light.

The Irish scholars then had nursed literature in their isolation, so that when peace returned to Europe it was from Ireland that the light came. We shall have to return later to the schools founded through Charlemagne all over Christendom, and we shall find that they trace back from Jarrow and Lindisfarn through Iona to the traditions which S. Patrick established from Rome. There was no interruption to their development in Ireland as there was nearly everywhere else; so that by the fortune of wars that part of Europe which was never Roman became actually the refuge of the Roman heritage; when the Roman culture came back from the far West again it was not wholly what it had been. It had lost and gained; but it had become fit now to inaugurate the Middle Ages. It represented the teaching of S. Gregory as the last of the Romans, but of S. Gregory with the life of a new empire infused in it. The Irish, who had never liked to obey an empire, were yet the foundation-builders of the new empire of Charlemagne that now arose.

RISE OF MOHAMMEDANISM

Another force that we shall see beating this empire into life and shape was the rise of Mohammedanism. Its founder, Mohammed, was born in 570; he was twenty years old therefore when S. Gregory the Great became pope. While in the West, Gregory was unconsciously building up the Papal monarchy, Mohammed in Syria and Palestine (beginning his career as a commercial traveller) was learning about Judaism and Christianity, imperfectly, no doubt, but sufficiently for his ultimate purpose. Also he fasted, prayed and had fits. When he was forty (S. Gregory had been dead six years, the mission of S. Augustine to the Anglo-Saxons was already in its thirteenth year), he was convinced he had received a revelation from S. Gabriel. This was in the year 610. In 622 his preaching of his new revelation roused his pagan neighbours to fury, and to save his life he had to escape by flight. This was the beginning of the Mohammedan era, for the year 622 under the name of the Hagira (Flight) corresponds in the enumeration of the Mohammedan centuries to our *anno-domini* 1. Within eight years he returned in triumph to the city of Mecca, which had been a sacred city long before he began his new religion. In 633 he died. In this new religion he had established a fighting faith, because he bequeathed to it his own belief that it was to be propagated by the sword. At the time he began it and for many years later, this was not unsuccessful, for in every direction Mohammedanism found itself surrounded by disorganised and disunited groups. In Persia the Sassanian dynasty was failing, in Africa the destructive work of the Vandals had left a weakness from which it still suffered; even in Spain the trail of the Vandals still lasted, and the confusion of the wars of the Visigoths made it an easy prey to every invader. Consequently, by the eighth century Christendom was ringed by a fence of Arab Mohammedan States—Syria captured in 634, Palestine in 637, Egypt in 640, North Africa in 695, and Spain in 711. Follow this on the map, noting the progressive sweep of conquest; even the Pyrenees were crossed at last, and the horde marched on over the remains of the Visigoths till it met the Franks. Its advance guard was met and destroyed by Charles

Martel at Tours in 732. His name, Martel, was won for him by this "hammering" of the Mohammedans, for it was immediately realised that he had saved Europe for the Christian faith. This invasion was the highest point in the West reached by the Mohammedan flood. It was only slowly that it abated in the West, but it abated all the time.

THE POPES AND THE EASTERN EMPERORS

Meanwhile the Papacy, though there were few individual great popes at this date, developed steadily its powers, without statecraft but by sheer inheritance. The list of names is barren of any (except Pope S. Agatho, for reasons which concern church history) with claims on public fame. Honorius I comes into the light only because he was thought at one time to have compromised the Faith, by writing a statement on the Will of Christ which was verbally inaccurate, though his teaching was known by other writings to have been orthodox. His statement was, of course, not couched as an infallible pronouncement. It was repudiated under Pope Agatho in the Sixth General Council (680-681). But the misstatement of Pope Honorius was due in measure to his desire not to hurt the feelings of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and incidentally of the Emperor Heraclius, by opposing a dogmatic pronouncement which they had put forward. Certainly through all this period the popes endeavoured to humour the Eastern emperors, though their pursuit of this policy was ill-requited by the emperors. Because Pope Martin I (649-653) disowned the letter of Honorius he was exiled to the Crimea; and the doctrine which Honorius had seemed to approve (that there was only one will in Christ, a divine, and not also a human will) was now defiantly advocated by patriarch and emperor against the official declarations of the Holy See. Under the guidance of Constantinople, the East as a whole rallied to the teaching of this heresy.

Meanwhile the Emperor Leo the Isaurian (717-741), a peasant from Cilicia, made the determination of the popes to be loyal to Byzantium increasingly difficult. Despite the prestige of S. Gregory in the West and the inevitable weakness of the Exarch

of Ravenna, the popes had been true to their political allegiance to Byzantium and had remained true, even when the Lombards had turned orthodox and, boasting themselves as faithful Catholics and victorious over the Italian dominions of Byzantium, wished the popes to acknowledge them as lawful sovereigns in their conquests and to break with the meddling and heretical emperors. At that very time the Emperor Leo, having beaten back the Mohammedans from his capital, took it on him to proclaim war on the figures of Christ or the statues of the saints. In 726 his edict was published, ordering the destruction of statues and all representations of the saints; the Exarch promulgated it in Ravenna. The people rose against the edict; the now orthodox Lombards under Liutprand seized the opportunity to profess publicly their faith in true Catholic doctrine and at the same time to accomplish their ambitions, and promptly invaded the exarchate and captured Ravenna; the Exarch promptly fled to Venice.

The Pope (now Gregory II) held a Council in Rome in 730, and excommunicated the Emperor, but meanwhile took every possible step to restore the imperial rule. The Lombards were induced to withdraw from Ravenna, a new exarch was sent for from Constantinople, and the Emperor once more recognised. But the Emperor, with incredible folly, repudiated his faithful political subject, the Pope, urged his armies to march on Rome, confiscated the Papal estates in Sicily, and demanded from the Pope a heavier subsidy. The people of Rome and the Lombards now took a hand in their own affairs and, despite the Pope, broke with the Emperor; his *Dux Romae* was expelled and his "army" of patrician nobles renounced their allegiance. Thus the Papacy came for a moment by chance and by invitation into the possession of the now empty territorial sovereignty of old Rome.

There were by now only three Powers of any consequence in the West—the Franks, the Lombards and the popes. The Franks could never hold Italy, but in any emergency they were always liable to be called into Italy. They were still more liable to be called to Rome. But though the popes and the Romans

might sometimes ask for Frankish protection or deliverance, they only asked for it because they knew it would never become permanent. The Frank was a foreigner. He would always have to leave the city at last. But the Romans would never ask aid from Lombards, for they held the North and South; if they entered Rome, they would make it a Lombard city. They would not be foreigners. They would intermarry with the people; they would remain.

Hence Gregory III (731-741), a Syrian (note the international character of the Papacy, even where it was beginning to be wholly Western), sent for Charles the Hammerer to protect him from the Lombard. His successor, Pope Zachary (741-752), a Greek, faced and forbade the Lombards, and after his successful denunciation of them returned in triumph to Rome. But the story is an endless and inconsequential story, the popes striving to save Italy for the emperors, and for that reason attacked by the Lombards, and yet attacked no less by the Emperor, who was jealous of the inevitable supremacy of Rome. The popes alone were able to keep the West in touch with the East, and alone were strong enough still even to believe in the possible common unity of Christendom. But there was no one else any longer to help them in their work; no one else cared for this dream of a single political commonwealth of nations. Each of the invading peoples was fighting for its own dreams.

The inevitable could no longer be deferred; in 751 the Lombards extinguished the exarchate, and in 754 the Franks marched on Pavia, the Lombard capital; in 757 the Pope received the mysterious donation of Pepin, whatever it may have included, and the temporal rule of the popes passed from fact into theory; all that is commonly meant by the Middle Ages had now begun.

THE CAROLINGS

But we must go back to the Franks. Their story had been left at the moment when Charles Martel had become the real leader of a united people (p. 82), though he was only the mayor of the

palace of a Frankish king. But the mayor of the palace had become an important official in the Merovingian court:

(i) He controlled the royal treasury, the taxation, the administration of the royal domains, and the granting out of the royal fiefs (or *beneficia*).

(ii) In Austrasia he had successfully made his office hereditary; but in Neustria only occasionally with success.



(iii) In Austrasia he was usually a noble and headed the nobility against the crown; in Neustria he was of humble origin and supported the crown against the nobility. In either court he stood as next in importance to the king.

But it is noteworthy that an Austrasian could accept the Neustrian kingdom and rule in Neustria without difficulty; but no Neustrian was ever accepted by the Austrasians as their direct ruler. Austrasia was the more independent of the two, but Neustria was considered the more important centre, for Paris or Soissons was more central and more cultured than Metz. By the time of Pepin II, the Austrasian kingship had ceased to exist; but as the mayor of the palace had now no palace left to admini-

ster, he had to change his title, and so he called himself duke or prince of the Franks, and claimed the mayoralty of the Palace of Neustria, where there still lingered a Merovingian king.

Pepin II deliberately, to avoid all jealousy by attempting to make legal his practical sovereignty, contented himself by warring against the Frieslanders under Ratbod till he had brought them into submission. His successor, Charles the Hammerer, had been Pepin's natural son and could not therefore be named as his heir; at his father's death, the widow proclaimed her son as his heir and put Charles in prison. But he soon escaped, and, gathering followers, grew in strength, fought steadily against Neustria, which had broken away and would not submit to the Austrasian duke, against Aquitaine, which supported Neustria, and against his stepmother and her child. After his victories in 716, 719 and 720 he collected the scattered Frankish dominions under his single rule:

(i) He did not delegate his powers as mayor of the palace to any official.

(ii) He kept the mayoral titles in Austrasia, Neustria and Burgundy.

(iii) He captured the last Merovingian king and kept him in close custody. Thus it was that he was ready to meet the invading Mohammedans with the united forces of all the Franks. On a wild Saturday in October 732, on the road from Poitiers to Tours, the infidel made his attack on the Frankish position and was beaten back so thoroughly that he left the commander and a vast number of the troops dead on the field. Their losses were enormous. But though they were ejected from Avignon and Nismes, they still held Narbonne when the Hammerer died.

That very year, too, of the battle of Tours the last of the Merovingians died; thenceforward to the end of his life Charles ruled the Franks, but only as a mayor of a palace in which there was no king. His reign was chiefly devoted to fighting against Saxons and Moors; and he was aided in this last by Liutprand of Lom-

bardy, who had married the sister of Charles' wife. He died on October 22nd, 741, and was buried in the abbey of S. Denis, outside Paris, the capital of his Neustrian kingdom.

At his death, again the kingdom was divided amongst his three sons, Carloman receiving Austrasia, Alemannia (Suabia) and Thuringia; Pepin III receiving Neustria, Burgundy and Provence; Grifo receiving a little kingdom carved out of the central meeting territories of Austrasia, Neustria and Burgundy.

Carloman, after a brief period, retired to Rome and was made a monk by Pope Zachary and founded a monastery on Mount Soracte in 747. It is to be noted that the monastery was dedicated to S. Sylvester, who in tradition had baptised Constantine. This is one of the many signs growing everywhere more apparent that show that the memory of old Rome was recovering and that the legend of the empire had begun again to haunt the imagination of Europe.

Grifo, frightened of Pepin, joined the revolted Saxons against his brother and finally fell fighting in 753.

By this elimination of both other brothers, once more the Frankish dominions were gathered into a single hand; it seemed therefore foolish to continue any longer the farce of the mayoralty since there was now no king in either of the kingdoms, and both kingdoms were now governed by one man. It was only right that the leader of the Franks should succeed to the title as well as the powers of royalty. Presumably at an assembly of the Franks, two great ecclesiastics were deputed to go to Rome and ask for leave for this. Why Rome? The pope had, without wishing it or at least without formally claiming it, become recognised at last as the heir of the imperial traditions, so that it was now his right to make and unmake kings, for since the kingship was a sacred office, like the priesthood, no one could take it for himself. Who then could make and hallow a king unless it were the pope? For no one any longer troubled about the far off Greek phantom on the shores of the Bosphorous.

But the pope, though he approved the step, could not yet come in person to crown and anoint *King Pepin III*; so Archbishop Boniface was deputed in his place as the foremost Church-

man of the West. Boniface (675-755) therefore performed the crowning and anointing himself

For this crowning of Pepin the choice of Boniface is noteworthy:

(i) Because Boniface was an Englishman from Crediton, in Devonshire, and brought with him to the Franks the traditions of his own people, where the idea of anointing a sovereign and crowning him had survived from the years of its conversion. Liturgical scholars are convinced that he used the Anglo-Saxon formula. The rubrics of his people were now brought into the general liturgy of the Western kings.

(ii) Because Boniface, as an Anglo-Saxon, was devoted to the See of S. Peter and gave to the Frankish monarchy the traditional devotion of his people to the Roman Papacy.

(iii) Because in an especial degree amongst the Anglo-Saxons, who were encamped on old Roman land and had rulers who bore the titles and insignia of the old Roman officials and imitated the old Roman coinage, there was a vivid and compelling reverence for the old traditions of the empire.

The coronation took place in November 751 at Soissons, which had shared with Paris the capital position of the Frankish State. At once followed a political act of great importance, a logical result of this action of Boniface under commission of the Holy See. The new pope, Stephen, in 753, after suffering from the effect of the Lombard victories, determined to face the Lombard king in person, and left Rome for Pavia on October 13, 753. He had his interview with Liutprand, and then took the daring step of leaving Pavia to cross the Alps and visit the Frankish king. His departure from Pavia for the north was clearly an appeal to the Franks over the heads of the Lombards; though the Lombards saw this and objected to it they were not strong enough to prevent it or even openly resent it.

On October 15th, 753, therefore Pope Stephen left Pavia to go over the Alps. He waited at the great monastery of S. Maurice (which is still in existence and still occupied by Augustinian canons) in the valley of the Rhone for Pepin to come. The King came towards south with his court and his family and "directed

his son Charles to meet the almost angelic pope," says the *Liber Pontificalis*. The Pope and the boy (later to be known as Charlemagne) met on the Feast of Kings, January 6th, 754, and then the two of them (Pope Stephen and the boy of twelve) rode forward to Ponthieu, where Pepin awaited them both. From Ponthieu they journeyed to Paris, and again, with English rites on July 28th, 754, Pepin was anointed and crowned "King of the Franks and Patrician of the Romans." The King's two sons were also crowned with him, Charles and Carloman.

The salient features of this act to be remembered are—

- (i) The anointing.
- (ii) The second title bestowed on Pepin, "Patrician of the Romans."
- (iii) The sons being crowned with him.

The result of this action of the Pope was to secure Pepin's whole-hearted support for the Papacy against its turbulent neighbours, the Lombards. In 755, and again in 756, the Franks crossed the Alps and defeated the Lombards, and on each occasion the Pope received from Pepin further grants of territory; on the second occasion a messenger reached Pepin from the East to demand the return of Ravenna and exarchate to the Emperor at Byzantium. Pepin declined, and gave the territory to the Pope.

CHARLEMAGNE

For the rest of his reign Pepin was busy at home; there he died on the 24th of September, 768, and was buried, like his father, at S. Denis. With the same curious lack of foresight as his father (the more surprising, considering his own difficulties at the beginning of his reign), he divided his kingdom between his two sons, Charles and Carloman; this time the dividing line of the Frankish kingdoms was made East and West—Charles had Austrasia, North Germany, Neustria and Aquitaine; Carloman had Burgundy, Provence and Suabia. Fortunately, however, for Charles, his brother Carloman died on the 4th of December 771: and this left once more a sole ruler of the Franks. It is certainly difficult to understand how these Frankish rulers from Clovis onwards

could each severally divide his territories on his death-bed, especially since each of them had known the cost to himself of this unhappy tradition. Presumably such a Frankish custom or law was too strong for them to break. Here, then, was Charles (born probably 742) by his brother's death become sole ruler of the Franks. He was now proclaimed king; just under thirty years of age (which was almost old for the average age of a Merovingian king), he stood over six feet in height, with large features, eyes, nose and mouth, and with flowing hair, first yellow and then in age snow-white. He had married a daughter of Desiderius, the new Lombard king, but she failed to bear him children, and the marriage was dissolved (he had already a wife still alive when he made this Lombard marriage). The princess was sent back to Lombardy in dishonour; this the Lombards never forgot nor forgave.

Meanwhile, a new pope had been elected—Hadrian I (772-795)—a Roman with the same sense of Roman greatness that Charles himself was to share, and that underlay the policies of so many of even lesser monarchs then in Christendom.

Hadrian almost immediately on taking office came into collision with the Lombards and, like his predecessors, again appealed against them to the Franks. Charles responded by assembling his armies, crossing the Alps, and fighting his way through to Pavia, where the Lombard king sat besieged. Leaving a force to watch him, Charles marched to Rome, the first of the Frankish sovereigns to do what already the Anglo-Saxon kings had so often done. He reached Rome on Easter Sunday 774, was met by a procession of nobles and churchmen, and was carried to S. Peter's, where the Pope awaited him. The two met and embraced as equals in greatness; and so indeed they were. The Pope led Charles to the tomb of the apostle, holding his right hand as they went together up the great nave. This was the beginning of a legend, a hope and a dream. It is the first visible prophecy of a Christendom that never quite came true.

On the Wednesday in that Easter week men saw the first evident result of that alliance, *the famous donation of Charlemagne*, described so carefully and yet so unconvincingly in the

Liber Pontificalis. Can Charlemagne really have agreed that the Pope should hold all the territories enumerated—everything in Italy except the Riviera, Piedmont, that part of Lombardy that is north of the Po, the city of Naples and Calabria? Is it possible? The historians dispute whether it is authentic and whether, if it be authentic, it means a temporal sovereignty for the popes over all that land, and by what reasoning Charlemagne could have thought he had the right to bestow it on the Pope.

We know that Charlemagne left Rome shortly after Easter, captured Pavia, was crowned King of Lombardy with the iron crown of Monza, and turned back to his work on the Rhine.

There he had to contend in a sturdy struggle with the Saxons, who fought him for two-and-thirty years. The Saxons in those days occupied, not the modern Saxony, but Hanover, Oldenburg, Westphalia, Brunswick and Holstein. These Saxons were chiefly pagans, and this made Charles, who had missionary ambitions of his own, all the more anxious to bring them under the rule of his Christian kingship. This warfare lasted with varying fortunes through the years of his reign, chiefly consisting of raids and hard fought battles on the part of the Saxons and of successful sieges and victories in the field on the part of Charles. His personal victories seem authentic enough, though at the time ineffectual; but his troops, when under other leaders, seemed almost invariably to fail. The great Saxon leader, Witikind, whose exploits were heroic enough to form the subject of numerous ballads and stories and who ended as a faithful Christian, a loyal vassal of the King, was for years his great opponent. But the Saxons as a whole, though they received Christianity under the victorious arms of Charlemagne, carried it lightly, and whenever they broke out in rebellion, immediately threw over their Christianity and returned to their pagan gods.

But the ruthlessness of Charles, who took away the sons of the Saxon nobles whom he conquered, had them educated in his monasteries, and made them Christians, and who removed wholesale the inhabitants from some of the Saxon villages and settled Franks in their places, finally achieved peace. By 808 his work here was completed. Saxony was made imperial and Christian.

But while the Saxon war lasted almost to the end of his reign the rest of his dominions did not leave Charles free to carry on his fighting without interruption; the intervals in it were occupied with subsidiary revolts amongst the Lombards (776) and the Bavarians under Tassilo III, whose wife was a sister of his own repudiated wife, Desideria; this latter chieftain was reconciled to Charles by Charles' own forbearance, supported by an appeal for peace despatched by Pope Hadrian in 781. Again the Austrasians revolted in 785 and the Lombards of Benevento in 787, and Tassilo, the very next year, in spite of all his promises, broke out again. Tassilo was forced to submit, and in the usual way with which revolting princes or superfluous heirs were dealt with, he was tonsured and sent into a monastery to become a monk. Tassilo, however, boggled at the tonsure. His royal descent from Merovingian kings gave his long hair a particular sanctity; it was a privilege of royalty to have unshorn locks; so he was allowed in the end by way of compromise to have his tonsure in private and to escape the indignity of having it done in public with his court looking on. Not only Tassilo, but the whole family, was compelled to become religious and to enter nunneries and abbeys—wife, daughters and sons.

In 792 came the revolt of Charles' eldest son, Pepin, beautiful but deformed, who was born out of wedlock. On this account he had been cut out of the succession and resented it, especially when one of the lawful children, Carloman, was later on given the ancestral name of Pepin, as though he, the hunchback, did not exist. The revolt was easily suppressed. Pepin's fate was similar to Tassilo's—a tonsure and the monastery of Prum on the Moselle.

Lombardy and Saxony being now reduced to order, Charles looked south to Spain. *The Moors* were still in occupation of almost all of it; for Charles' father had only completed his father's work by driving them from Narbonne and thus clearing the whole of Gaul of their occupation. However, the Moors of Spain were divided, and one of the parties into which they were split invited Charles' aid, promising him in return the sovereignty of the whole of Spain. Probably besides this political inducement Charles

had religious ambitions also and hoped to Christianise Spain; he had always a zeal, though a harsh zeal, to spread the faith. In 778 at Easter, he left Aquitaine on the expedition that ended in the famous battle at Roncesvalles. Through the first of the great French poems, *the Song of Roland*,* we have a vivid picture of victory, of that last ride, of the band of Paladins holding the pass, of the defeat of the infidel, of the escape of the army, and at the death of Roland of the return of Charlemagne. Actually, however, the expedition seems to have been a rather sad failure. Charles captured Pampeluna, which, however, we now discover to have been at the time a Christian city; for the rest, he marched over a good deal of territory, but did nothing of any lasting character; his army was indeed surprised on its way back over the Pyrenees, not by the Moors, but by the Basques. It was the *Wascones* who descended on the rear-guard led by Eggihard the Seneschal, Anselm the count of the palace, and Hruodland the warden of the Breton March. This was on the 18th of August 778. It was the Christian Wascones, and not the Moors, who drove them through the pass of Roncesvalles into France again.

Later on again Charles hoped to effect the conquest of Spain, but though he commissioned his son Louis the Debonair, whom he made King of Aquitaine, to organise the recovery of the Peninsula, nothing final was achieved beyond the capture of Barcelona (801) and Tolosa (811), and an alliance with Alfonso the Chaste, King of Galicia, Prince of the Asturias, and Lord of that very Pampeluna which Charles had so wantonly seized. Possibly Charles achieved this much good indirectly that he disturbed the Moors by taking sides in their domestic quarrel.

We find him, however, very friendly with other infidels, even the famous Caliph Haroun-al-Raschid in Bagdad. He received from him an elephant which reached Aachen with its Mahout, Isaac the Jew, and died after eight years, in 810, when it was being used in one of his campaigns across the Rhine. He received a second embassy from the Caliph of Bagdad, suggesting that they should come to an agreement over the possession of the

*Perhaps the best edition is by Scott-Moncrieff (1919).

Holy Places of Jerusalem, and one also from the Emir of Cordova in 807 with proposals for a treaty of peace.

Certainly one other positive good resulted from the Frankish invasions of Spain; at Barcelona, wardens of the Marches were settled on the coast with the title of counts to guard the passes. One day they were to become independent Christian monarchs and to inherit the kingdom of Aragon, and in the end to unite all Spain under the Faith.

The restless energy of Charles that battled with Spain, Lombardy and Saxony, now drove him to take interest in the strange nation that had settled between the Danube and the Carpathians, a mixture of the Huns who had invaded it in the fourth century, and of *The Avars* who had entered it about the later half of the sixth century; after Charles' day it was to be called Hungary and to be ruled by the Magyars. But in the eighth and ninth centuries the Avars were the ruling race, a predatory people who lived in settlements surrounded by strange ringed stockades, which must have been survivals from the days when they were nomads and which were even in Charles' time the only form of town they knew.

The particular reasons that made Charles declare war on them are stated by his chronicler to have been: (i) his fear of becoming effeminate through peace, since he had had two complete years without war; (ii) the malice of the Avars towards the Church of Christian people; and (iii) the impossibility of obtaining justice from them for their raids into his territories though the King had sent his *missi* or ambassadors to demand it. The expedition was led by Charles in 791, and proved to be only a demonstration in force; the Avars were terrified by his joint land and river expedition; they abandoned their cities and fled. In 795 some of the Avars with one of their princes sent messengers with submission to the King; the prince was baptised and sent back to convert his people. Meanwhile, Charles, fearing a recurrence of the Saxon war and its support from the Avars, attempted to dig a canal between the Danube and the Rhine (or rather between the nearer tributaries of each, the Altmühe and the Rezat) so as to be able in case of need to transport his troops from one front

to another. However, the marshy soil defeated his engineers, and all that remained (and it still remains) is the Fossa Carolina, five miles S.W. of Weissenburg.

Little else, however, was needed to be done in order to tranquillise this new region; the head of the Avars in 805 was a Christian and humbly asked leave of the King to bring back his people in quiet. They were left in quiet. Yet earlier they had been so terrible in war that the Emperors of Byzantium had had repeatedly to buy them off with huge bribes of gold. This gold, stored in one of their stockade-cities, was captured by Charles' general Eric, Duke of Friuli; out of gratitude to God for the success of this expedition, he shared this spoil with the Roman Church.

This recapturing of its gold was not Charles' only connection with *Byzantium*; to its court had fled the Lombard prince, Adelchis, whose father, Desiderius, Charles had dethroned in 774. Adelchis had hoped to get aid from the Greeks against Charles, but could not secure it. The Empress Irene, the joint ruler with her young son Constantine VI, a boy of nine, had other plans. She asked for a marriage between her son and Charles' daughter, Gertrude (or Hrotrud), aged respectively ten and eight. Matters got so far advanced that a tutor was sent to teach the little princess Greek. This was important, not for the princess (for the proposed marriage never took place), but for Charles.

(i) It meant that the Byzantine court publicly acknowledged his imperial dignity.

(ii) It brought a Greek master (Elissœus) into touch with Charles' literary court. The date was 781 or 782.

Meanwhile, Irene in 787 summoned the Seventh General Council at Nicæa, to settle the dispute about images; the Council defined:

(a) That external "adoration" could be shown to holy images, but

(b) That this "adoration" was relative and must be distinguished from the adoration to be shown only to God.

Was the Empress by this doctrinal settlement looking towards

Rome for reunion? That certainly was not the least of her hopes. But the marriage between the two imperial houses was broken off, the chroniclers of each Court claim that their side no longer entertained the idea; a more amazing proposal also fell through, that Charlemagne should marry Irene and the West and East again be made one.

Immediately on the failure of the child-marriage, the Greeks invaded Calabria, only to be overwhelmingly defeated in 788 by Charles and his Lombard dukes; in return Charles tore Istria on the north-west of Italy from Byzantium and held it to round off his territories, which now included and went beyond the old Roman frontiers of the Rhine and the Danube.

This imperial vision of Charles was at last consecrated, apparently not only without his will, but even against his will, by the grateful successor of Hadrian, *Leo III*, elected pope at the end of 795.

Immediately after his election Leo sent to Charlemagne, officially only the Patrician of Rome, in token of his political submission, the keys of the tomb of S. Peter and the banner of the city; and he made this act historic by ordering it to be put in mosaic in the Tridininian of the Lateran palace, in the ruins of which, behind the Sancta Scala, a much later copy is still to be seen. In it Charles is shown genial and beardless, while the Pope receives from S. Peter the pallium of jurisdiction. Letters were exchanged between the two, in which the double Christian policy is again stated: "It is ours," says the King, "externally to defend the Church and internally to fortify it by acknowledging the Catholic Faith; it is yours to pray for the victory of Christendom and the magnifying of the name of Christ."

Three years later Leo was suddenly seized during the Rogation procession of April 28th, 799, and half-blinded by a conspiracy of violent nobles and dragged, crushed and wounded, to a monastery on the Cœlian Hill. Accusations of forgery and nameless crimes were made against the Pontiff, but it is clear that his real crime was to have aroused the anger of some of the nobles, though it is not clear how he had done this. From the monastery the Pope escaped to S. Peter's, recovering his strength and his

eyesight against all expectation—"miraculously" it was rumoured by the people. Thence he was rescued by the Duke of Spoleto, one of Charles' Frankish rulers, who had been put in charge of part of his Lombard domain. Before the summer was over Leo III crossed the Alps and appealed in person to Charles himself against the accusations of the nobles. The King, who received his guest honourably, was too busy over one of his interminable Saxon wars to be able to do more than listen to the Pope and to his accusers, who had hurried after him, and send the Pope back in honour to Rome. It was at Paderborn that this meeting was held, and so quickly was the affair managed that the Pope entered his city in triumph again on the feast of S. Andrew, November 30th, in the same year, 799.

The next year Charles marched down the Adriatic coast, and, staying at Ravenna in the old palace of Theodoric, was touched by the imperial splendours of it, more imposing in that age, sufficiently imposing even to us after a thousand years. From Ravenna he turned by the Via Salaria towards Rome; at Nomentum Leo went out to visit him and then returned to Rome to prepare for the royal pageant, which was to greet Charles on this his second visit, twenty-seven years after his first. Charles was now the foremost ruler in the whole of Christendom; the richest, the most successful in war, in peace, and in administration, as well as the prince most devoted to learning in his time. Down through the Via Salaria Charles entered the city and rode to the steps of S. Peter's, and then climbed them to where the Pope waited to receive and bless him; together, as before with Hadrian, King and Pontiff entered the basilica and moved to the shrine of the Apostle; this was on November 24th, 800, in Charles' fifty-eighth year.

On December 1st, at a public synod, the King sat to listen to the accusations against the Pope, leaving it to the clerics to judge the case. The clergy decided that they could "not dare to judge the Apostolic See, which is the head of all the Church of God." This was good law, both canonical and civil; neither Justinian nor Theodosius would have allowed cleric or lay to judge the Pope.

Meanwhile it was remarked that the Patrician of Rome had begun to wear in Rome the patrician's court dress, his tunic and cloak and shoes; the blue and silver and sable of the Frankish court (which the King hitherto had worn) and the gartered Gothic boots were put aside.

CHARLEMAGNE CROWNED EMPEROR

Yet, it was apparently without his previous knowledge of what was to happen that, as he knelt, so clad, at the shrine of S. Peter on Christmas day, the Pope came over to him, placed over his shoulders the purple robe of empire and on his head a golden crown: the people shouted in acclamation. After centuries, Rome once more, Pope and people, had chosen for themselves an emperor at last.

Was it lawful? No pope certainly had as yet claimed the right to appoint an emperor; but the people themselves, "the faithful Romans," and not the Pope acclaimed him Emperor. Was there any other power that could make an emperor except the people of Rome? By what right had any emperor ruled in Rome except by the acclamation of the people? The Pope was also the Roman bishop. If the people acclaimed the Emperor, the Pope must surely bless him. It will be remembered that a pope had already crowned and anointed him during his father's lifetime, when his father had been anointed and crowned king. It will be remembered, too, that when Archbishop Boniface had first crowned Pepin, Charles' father, he had used the Anglo-Saxon formula and had implied that Pepin had succeeded to the imperial tradition of Rome. For some curious reason this imperial tradition always attracted and imposed itself on the Anglo-Saxons; what Boniface had done for his father, Alcuin, another of the same race, had done to him by speech and letter, and already had put in his mind the glamour of the imperial title.

Yet, Einhard, Charles' friend and biographer, states quite definitely that Charles disliked the ceremony: "Would that I had never entered S. Peter's on Christmas day!" It is not evident why he disliked it. He had nothing to lose by any oppo-

sition on the part of Byzantium; in effect Byzantium did not appear to have been in any way disturbed by it—a Western Augustus was part of their tradition and in theory did not rend, but united the single empire of Rome. Indeed, in 808 the Emperor Nicephorus sent an embassy to him, and the successor of Nicephorus, Michael, hailed him in 812 as *imperator and basileus*, an equal emperor.

It has been thought that perhaps Charles objected to receiving the crown from the Pope as it seemed to put him under the Papacy; but no one then thought of the Pope as politically the Emperor's master. The Pope had already openly received his temporalities under the gift of Charles himself. Nor can it have been mock humility, a play, this shrinking from dignity. No one can think of Charles doing that.

There was evidently some strong distaste or regret on Charles' part for the affair. Yet we find it hard to see why he was so distressed. His crowning as Augustus saved the Middle Ages, gave it the ideal of a central political power; above all, gave to Christendom the assurance that it was a single unit of popular organisation and kept alive the hope of unity between East and West.

There are only two other wars in which Charles became involved—war with the Slavs and war with the Danes. In both he was ultimately successful. He had touched the whole of the West and had nowhere failed.

Towards the end of his life (from 795 to 810) he settled himself to his majesty at *Aachen* (the Roman *Aquisgranum*, the French *Aix-la-Chapelle*), a palace copied from the palace of Theodoric in Ravenna by his architect, Master Odo, and a chapel of Our Lady copied from San Vitale in the same city. Only the chapel remains, whence the city gets its modern French name.

Only the Anglo-Saxon kings held aloof from him, insolently claiming imperial dignity also, and wishing to be treated on equal terms: Offa, in 789, refusing to allow his daughter to marry Charles' namesake son unless his own son was also to be allowed to marry Bertha, a daughter of Charles. Charles' daughters lived with the King and travelled with him; whenever the King moved from his home there must have moved with him a huge

cavalcade. His family went with him, the boys bred to the chase and war or to the Church, the girls to the distaff and spindle. Charles had twenty-one children—lawful and unlawful. Despite certain persistent stories of ill-fame in medieval tradition about him, in some dioceses he was and is still honoured as a Saint.

The life of him by Einhard describes him as a fine figure: "His gait was firm, all the habit of his body was manly; his health was good till his last four years, when he was stricken with fever and at the last limped with one foot. All his life he disliked and disobeyed his doctors, who tried to persuade him to give up eating his wonted roast meat for boiled meat. He was fond of exercise, of riding and hunting, and was a frequent and skilful swimmer. Though temperate in food and drink, and a hater of drunkenness, he found the Church fasts hard to bear. At daily supper he partook only of four courses, except for his daily roast meats. He loved music, he delighted in being read to (especially S. Augustine's *City of God*), but he slept ill. Eloquent, he learnt Latin, and even prayed in it; he read Greek, but pronounced it with difficulty. He studied grammar, computation and astronomy, but he studied writing too late in life for him to be able to use a pen. He kept tablets and pencils under his pillow so as to accustom his fingers to the exercise when he woke in the night; it was all too late. That art he never learnt.

"He was in his chapel morning and evening, and always at Mass; he loved the liturgy and the Church ceremonies, he sang and reformed the chaunt."

Charles' last years were clouded with deaths, his sons died, on whom he had settled the kingdoms of his empire—Charles and the Younger Pepin—only Louis was left. In 813, at an assembly of the *generalis conventus*, with the counsel and assent of the nobles, Louis was proclaimed emperor and Augustus, and crowned as heir universal to all Charles' domains.

In the January of the next year Charles had fever, fasted to overcome it, but was attacked by pleurisy and died on 28th of January 814. There are legends of his body being discovered by the Emperor Otho (who came to place him in a finer shrine) in the year 1000, clothed and seated in majesty and incorrupt.

The body was again translated in 1165 by Frederick Barbarossa, and in 1215 by Frederick II. His relics are still in existence and still shown.

His life was famous; he was indeed a great monarch; he touched Christendom at every point. His court restored learning to Christendom—learning in every form that was then possible. The old script of the Lombards gave way under the inspiration of his scholars to the minuscule that came from Ireland; the text of the Sacred Scriptures and of the classical authors was carefully studied, and the best that was possible then was done to preserve them intact. A school for boys was begun at his court, also a higher academy for the more learned, and a group of literary men surrounded him and proved their quaint and curious learning by giving each other classical and fantastic names. In these schools and by these scholars the clerical arts, the liberal arts, and the fine arts were all encouraged and developed. His biographer tells us that Charles was astonished to find that the sons of his nobles were incredibly stupid, while the sons of the lower classes were keener and more alive; these were the ones then whom he promoted in the Church and at court. The noble boys were stupid, as he told them, because they thought too much of games and of their handsome faces. He cared for neither; he wanted keenness and wits.

His great contribution to the science of government was *first* his institution or development of the *missi dominici*, who were justices in eyre, tax gatherers, and supervisors of administration, sent to watch the dukes and *comites* and their underlings (*centenarii* and *vicarii*) and to see that justice was administered, that the Church was not oppressed, nor orphans, nor widows, nor women, nor poor folks; and *second* his *scabini*, who were local justices and jurors, and sat in sevens to try the causes in the local courts. They were local people, enrolled as assessors to the *comites* and *centenarii* in the royal courts; and he deliberately chose local people so as to give the magistrate the assistance of knowing the local customs, and the local memory, both as to land-rights and boundaries, and to the good-name of accused men. Their adverse judgment was final; presumably when

unanimous. Are they the origin of the jury system? They are paralleled certainly by the juries of the later times.

CHARLEMAGNE'S SUCCESSORS 814-987

But all this fine work of Charlemagne was immediately imperilled and in many instances overthrown in the succeeding reigns. Charlemagne, like so many of the great rulers of Christendom, established a brief period which afterwards was looked back to as a dream, a memory, and a hope; his magnificent achievements failed at the instant, but succeeded when they had passed from fact into theory. He became a legend; as a legend he inspired the ages that followed. All the rest of the Middle Ages was spent in striving after the ideal which it was thought had once been seen in reality, a passing glimpse of the empire of romance.

Louis (814-840), who inherited the undivided empire, enacted some decrees of great value.

In 822 he restored freedom of episcopal election.

In 817 he approved the reorganised Benedictine rule under S. Benedict of Aniane and settled, too, the monastic discipline of canons regular as well as of monks.

In 840 he confirmed the Pope in all the temporal possessions with which Charlemagne had endowed the Holy See, retaining, however, for himself and his successors civil supremacy in the city and duchy of Rome. But his reign is chiefly occupied with the quarrels between his sons Lothair, Pepin, and Lewis, to whom a fourth was added—Charles (called *the Bald*)—the son of his second wife, Judith of Bavaria. These quarrelled both with each other and with their father, who was deposed and brought back to his throne at intervals during his long reign. At his death, however, the quarrels broke out anew and were only finally settled at the treaty of Verdun in 843. This treaty gave to—

Lothair as emperor a long-stretching middle kingdom from the mouth of the Rhine through Lorraine and Switzerland to Rome:

Lewis as king, all the land to the East of this—Old Saxony, Franconia and Bavaria;

Charles as king, all the land to the West, from Antwerp to the Pyrenees.

Lothair's son, Lewis, dying without issue in 875, left his territories to his uncle, Charles the Bald, King of the Western and now also of the Central Carolingian domain.

But the whole of the rest of this period is a welter of fighting between the West and East; between France as it came to be and Germany as it has become, for the possession of the Lotharingian territories and the domination of Christendom.

But Charles the Fat (884-887) King of the Eastern territory, dying in 888, his nephew, Arnulph, was chosen emperor and crowned by Pope Formosus in 896; thus the race of Charlemagne continued to hold the imperial title after coronation by the Pope, till Lewis (the last male on the side of Lewis, the elder grandson to Charlemagne) who ruled uncrowned as the King of the Romans and died in 911. The royal crown was then offered to and accepted by Conrad of Franconia (911-918), who was himself remotely of the Carolingian house. At his death the succession went to a stranger in blood, Henry the Fowler (919-936). Similarly in the West, Charles the Simple (whose wife was the daughter of Edward the Elder) began his rule in 898, was dethroned in 922 and was succeeded by Raoul of Burgundy (923-936). At Raoul's death, the son of Charles the Fat, who had fled to England, returned to rule, but he was always considered as a foreigner—*Louis Outre-Mer* (936-954). He in turn bequeathed his throne to two more generations of descendants till the line was broken by the intrusion of the Capets in 987. By the end of one hundred and seventy years since Charlemagne's death his race had ceased to rule anywhere in Christendom.

THE REAL DARK AGES

This general period of confusion (the real Dark Ages) which followed closely on the death of Charlemagne, was rendered worse by the scandals in the Papacy. One and thirty popes ruled between 891 and 999; it is the most terrible period of the Papal rule; vice, weakness and faction are the outstanding features of the time. Once or twice in history we find these periods

of moral decline in the lives of the popes, though not, of course, in their moral or doctrinal teaching, enforcing the salutary lesson that the Church does not owe her conservation to human deviation or prudence, and that the gates of hell shall never prevail against her. The general political disruptive forces were:

- (i) Civil wars.
- (ii) Impossibility of any one man's being able to supervise the huge empire of Charlemagne.
- (iii) Consequent independence of local rulers.
- (iv) Arrival and devastation of the Northmen, beginning in 836. These—
 - (a) destroyed the centres of wealth, which were also centres of culture;
 - (b) retarded the development of civilisation;
 - (c) but contributed, after their conversion, to its brilliant recovery.

Meanwhile, the separation of the Eastern Church from the Western is to be chronicled through the Schism of Photius at the moment when the greatest of the Roman popes of the period, Nicholas the Great (Nicholas I), ruled in Rome. The story of the disputes is matter for Church history, but the name of Photius, intruded as Patriarch into Constantinople, has to be remembered. At first by falsifying the letters of the Pope, and at last by accusing the Pope of crimes, he persuaded the Emperor to summon a synod in 866, which calling itself œcumenical, and sitting in judgment on Nicholas, excommunicated and deposed him. The circular letter in which this was declared added accusations against the whole Latin Church in 866, including the famous refusal to accept the phrase "the Holy Ghost, who proceeded from the Father *and the Son*." The Emperor Michael (842-867) who had abetted Photius, was murdered in a drunken orgy and the new Emperor (Basil the Macedonian, 867-886) expelled Photius and recalled the extruded Patriarch Ignatius, whose first act was to urge on the Emperor a reconciliation with Rome. This was effected in 869 and 870 by a council in Constantinople, called the Eighth General Council of the Universal Church. But at the death of Ignatius the Patriarch, in 877,

Photius was recalled and made his successor. In spite of imperial pressure, Rome refused to acknowledge his legitimacy in the See. Photius, however, held his power till he was again expelled by a new emperor in 886 (Leo VI, 886-912), and died in exile in 893. Eventually this schism became complete. At this stage it was only a passing quarrel, concerning in fact the appointment of a patriarch, but including in the minds of the disputants the long opposition of East and West. What the Eastern empire never realised till at the eve of its fall was that in the Papacy lay all the while its only hope of permanence.

Meanwhile, on the West had now settled that deeper darkness that heralds a new dawn.

CHAPTER IV

FEUDALISM IN THE MAKING

THE next period of history stretches from the failure of the heirs of Charlemagne to the failure of the heirs of the Hohenstaufen, from the death of King Conrad in 918 to the death of Conradin in 1268; it is an age of ambition, of idealism, and of fulfilment—with the inevitable disillusionment in men's minds at the poor results attained from so much idealism, debated and achieved; so much splendour and so little good. The immense influence of what Charlemagne almost achieved, a single Christendom governed by one political ruler and inspired by the venerable teaching of Christ's spiritual vicar upon earth, seemed throughout all this period to be the only hope for the peaceful life of mankind. Yet it was an ideal, which actually several times realised, never proved in men the peaceful life which it promised. It was not enough for the emperors to rule all Christendom, somehow life remained as disturbed as it had ever been.

On the death of King Conrad succeeded Henry the Fowler (918-936), who up till his nomination as king, had been Duke of the Saxons; his reign seemed to promise a revival of the shattered dream of Charlemagne. But it was a reign chiefly spent in welding into coherence the broken elements of the Germanic tribes and in securing peace for them from the enemies outside their borders, the Magyars of Hungary, the Danes and the Wends. Henry's kingdom, however, was limited at first to the Eastern Franks, though later it included the Middle Kingdom of Lotharingia. Small though it was, this territorial unity was the beginning of an era of national unity, achieved by the same slow process by which Edward the Elder and Athelstan (whose sister married Henry's son Otto) knit the English into a single people.

THE SAXONS 936-1002

It should, however, be noted as a tribute to the success of Charlemagne that it is the very Saxons against whom he had waged incessant war who now took over the organising of the Eastern half of the Frankish empire.

Henry's three successors, Otto I (936-973), and Otto II (973-983), and Otto III (983-1002), all did their best to make what by now had become in sheer distance of time the Carolingian legend once more a practical and real policy; the Roman empire (idealised in the vision of Charlemagne into a polity of all Christian peoples, including all in the mystic body of Christ and governed by pope and emperor in such fine fashion as to bring all into union with God) still seemed to them an ideal not beyond recovery, and it was at times very nearly fulfilled in the only way then possible to them.

Otto I began by being crowned at Aachen where Charlemagne's body still reposed, and acted at once as though his father's death gave him authority over Franconia and Bavaria. The dukes of Franconia and Bavaria resented this and continued to fear his act of succession. Consequently he was always in danger of civil war, and his policy of promoting his family to vacant duchies did not lessen this danger, although he was careful to limit the rights of the new dukes by means of his system of creating in each duchy counts palatine, nominated to watch over the royal interests in the five nations: Lorraine, Saxony, Franconia, Swabia and Bavaria.

Further to the east, beyond the borders of these five nations, he established a chain of marks, from the Baltic to the Adriatic, of which the most important were the most northerly, the Mark of the Billungs (so called after Hermann Billung, its loyal marquis), then beneath that coastal strip the North Mark and the Mark of Lausitz (which lay between Pomerania and Poland on the east, and Saxony on the west), the East Mark, which, cut out of Bavaria, protected it against Hungary, and the Mark of Verona, which covered the northern and western shores of the top of the Adriatic. These marks were definitely military states, the appointment of their chiefs being with the king and the mar-

graves or marquises (i.e. lords of the Marches) having armed forces always at their command; powerful as these chiefs became, their influence was almost always on the king's side in any civil war; but their particular contribution to European history was their steady influence in Christianising and organising their half-pagan border territories. The founding of walled towns, monasteries and bishoprics were the main methods used by them, and the effect of this policy of theirs was first to create a line of eastern defence against aggression, and eventually to provide a line of attack whence in the twelfth century the Faith could move eastwards and gradually absorb more peoples into Christendom.

Not only there, however, but in all the duchies, the Ottos used the Church for the furtherance of their organising scheme. Bruno, later Archbishop of Cologne, the younger brother of Otto I, was set over the Chancery, and he trained a school of young ecclesiastics who were more serviceable to the emperors than lay-officers could have been. Incapable of founding an hereditary fief, on account of their vow of celibacy, they could be employed in local work of administration or justice without any fear that they would diminish the royal authority. Naturally the emperors, in return for this service, defended any ecclesiastical properties that were threatened by the feudal nobility who, from acting at first as the temporal "advocates" of ecclesiastical foundations in matters of jurisdiction which touched life and death (forbidden to the clergy as causing a canonical irregularity), tried to intrude themselves into the ecclesiastical lordships and to claim as their own the feudal dues.

This will explain how it befell, that, later, the German bishops and clergy were often on the imperial side in its disputes with the Papacy over the right of investitures; for since the prelates stood to gain so much from royal and imperial protection, and since the king or emperor had the appointment of the bishops in his own hands, and since the feudal custom gave the king the right of investing those who held of him with their symbols of office, it was no strange thing to find bishops and abbots content to receive from their defender and political overlord, not indeed spiritual consecration or jurisdiction, but at least the symbols of

that ecclesiastical office to which he had in effect promoted them.

It was natural, too, that in the reigns of the Ottos ecclesiastics should enter largely into the political disputes and wars of the empire, partly because they were often related in blood to the king or the dukes or margraves, partly because their bishopric or abbacy gave them feudal prominence and wealth, and partly because their profession implied that they were better trained or better educated than the lay lords. Particularly during the long minority of Otto III and generally of the whole imperial period, the influence of the bishops was continuously used to hold Germany together when politically its unity seemed impossible to maintain; just as England was ruled by a single primate long before she was ruled by a king, since Canterbury's supremacy was based on the deliberate policy of the Papacy, which aimed at unifying England, prefiguring the supremacy of Winchester and later of Westminster over the heptarchy and its survivals.

THE SAXON EMPERORS AND THE POPES

But since the emperors were thus in touch with their bishops they could not avoid coming into touch also with the pope. Even from Germany they could not but look to Rome; indeed, it was Rome that lured them to the completion even of their political ambition, for it was only in Rome and from the Papal hands that it seemed, from the memory of Charlemagne, that empire could be formally received or restored. Each of the Ottos went to Rome to be crowned; so indeed did every emperor to the end of this period. It seemed as though both place and pontiff were necessary before the imperial power could be lawfully exercised, until at last (what was perhaps implicit in the public polity of the Faith) the popes held it to be the common law of Christendom that only they could confer on the emperor his right to bear the name and fulfil the office of his supreme rule.

There are, moreover, various consequences of this imperial coronation which need to be remembered:

- (i) It gave the king in Germany a constant interest in Italy

and was a reminder of the imperial claim to rule over all Italy, except in so far as the gifts of Pepin and Charlemagne, real or fabled, deliberately surrendered to the pope the patrimony of S. Peter. The effect of this Italian connection was to weaken imperial efficiency even in Germany, for the emperors, claimants to rule over the Alps, could seldom remain content with the possible government of their own country, and hungered for the impossible government of the lands across the mountains. By aiming at an Italian principedom, they neglected their home affairs. Some even like Otto III, or Frederick II, were more interested in Italy than in Germany; and on account of this Italian connection, the general result in medieval times was that the empire was merely a name and a distraction.

(ii) These excursions of the emperors into Italy, usually for their coronation, nearly always meant either a conflict with the pope or his political subjection; it was seldom enough that pope and emperor could adjust their claims to suit in practice each other's policy. Oftener the sequel to the advance on Rome was the immediate setting up of an anti-pope; in order that the emperor might secure legality of some kind for his coronation when the lawful pope refused it to him. Otto III, only twenty-two years old when he died, was almost the only emperor to find a pope (Sylvester II, famous before his Papacy as Gerbert of Aurillac, monk, mathematician, and philosopher) as a fellow-worker or fellow-dreamer in the imperial cause. Almost alone these two saw the respective spheres of their government—the spiritual and the temporal—as compatible and co-ordinated and not in conflict. But Otto's settlement in Rome and his palace, built on the Aventine Hill in Rome near the ruins of the palaces of the older Cæsars, produced rather alienation from Germany than effective rule in Rome. For while Otto was friendly with the Pope he lost influence with the German bishops, who were at the moment offended by the Pope's action in setting up two new primates, at Gnesen and Gran. The erection of these two archbishoprics implied the recognition of the national

independence of Poland and Hungary, and the public rejection of the theory that the German king was by right lord of Christendom.

(iii) It brought into violent collision the two rulers of the joint government of the Christian world. The normal theory of the Middle Ages (putting aside exaggerations uttered in times of crisis) declared the sovereignty and supremacy of the Church in things spiritual, and the sovereignty of the State in things temporal: the Church, in virtue of the subordination of the temporal as a means to achieve the spiritual, having the right to intervene in the temporal. This "indirect" (the phrase used is that of S. Thomas Aquinas) power of the Papacy explains the position claimed by the great popes. In practice it is sometimes difficult to differentiate between what is spiritual and what is temporal. But the theory is clear, and has always been maintained in the Church. It will be remembered that the act of Pope Leo, almost against Charlemagne's will, had made him emperor, i.e. Augustus, part ruler, with the emperor at Byzantium, of the empire of Rome. After the failure of the Carolingian heirs, there had sprung up shadowy figures in the north of Italy, styling themselves emperors, though possessing little territory and less authority. These and their pretensions were swept aside by Pope John XII, who crowned Otto I in Rome on 31st of January, 962. In effect, the Papacy had again, as in the case of Charlemagne, transferred the empire to a new line of kings—the Saxon dynasty. But this brought also its logical issue, for when a pope appeared who determined not only to make but to unmake an emperor, it could not seem fantastic that he should claim to do so on the strength of what had once been done and of what was still possible to do. Thus, in the saying of Gregory VII, "The Pope was the Master of Emperors"; thus, too, Alexander III asked, "From whom does the Emperor hold the empire if not from the Pope?" and Innocent III asked if it were not true that it was the Apostolic See that had transferred the empire from the East to the West, and that it had done this ultimately because the same See confers the imperial crown.

Extravagant as these claims seemed to be even to some of those who heard them, yet there were the facts to which Innocent III could and did appeal.

These facts, in a feudal age, seemed to prove what the reverse facts had proved in the investiture quarrel. If the emperors and the princes of Christendom claimed that the bishops and abbots should receive from them crozier and ring because these acts were needed to show that bishops and abbots were the "men" of their feudal lords, did not the fact that the emperor received his imperial crown from the hands of the pope equally show that the emperor was the pope's man? If the acceptance of crozier and ring from his lord proved that the bishop was his feudal subject, did not the acceptance of imperial crown from the pope prove that the emperor was his feudal subject too? The facts seemed to support the theory, even though it might not be possible to prove that the facts had taken place because of the theory.

RISE OF LOCAL SOVEREIGNTIES

But before proceeding with this quarrel between pope and emperor it is necessary to recall the dissolution of the empire that had followed on the collapse of the central authority of the Carolingian kings. Christendom had fallen apart into a mass of little chieftains, perpetually at strife amongst themselves, till they gradually surrendered to the greater force or greater statecraft of some one of the neighbouring chiefs, who assumed a sovereignty which his power justified. Without these local sovereigns the whole policy of Christendom would have been robbed of coherence and life. But these local sovereigns, while they effected in their own territories first peace and then order, were themselves by that very fact opposed to any larger amalgamations that would have pushed them into the same condition of vassalage to a more powerful sovereign that their vanquished rivals had been compelled to accept. Their feudal lordships had indeed saved Europe, but as the three and a half centuries of this period pass onwards, these feudal lordships are seen to become the bane of European peace and order. The local sovereignties were proof of the possibility of future larger sovereignties over them, but

they were no less a signal of what dangers yet lurked to defeat Europe's final recovery to a single unity again.

For, to anyone who reads the books and follows the practice of the Middle Ages, one of its features was its passion for forming groups. Like shattered quicksilver, the lesser fragments tended to coalesce; happily, unlike quicksilver, each group, once built up, held to its individuality. Groups of individual trades or professions or forms of life had been driven to coalesce in order to protect themselves from local aggression; but it was discovered that their only chance, even against local aggression, was to have a force behind them more than merely local. Gradually therefore these forces tended, in an age not yet possessed of a strong sense of nationality, to become—in our phrase—international. It helped them to have a base outside their own borders and so to be able to deal with their local opponents from the vantage ground of an organisation beyond their reach.

Thus the dislocation of society created by the failure of the Carolingians to govern the empire was gradually remedied by the building up of local sovereignties, which became merged in turn into larger groupings; and professions and trades similarly formed themselves into fellowships with their corresponding trades and professions, all over Christendom.

This very international character, for instance, of the baronage, or of the Church, of the king, of the towns, became in its turn a danger to the new systematic peace of Christendom. During the years of the collapse of public order the local sovereignty of a baron did create, as far as his power extended, settled peace and order; even at the price of tyranny to which such sovereignty might easily descend, there was enough gain in stability of life for the subjects of it to be contented with their lot. But once in countries, or provinces, or duchies, a strong ruler attempted to build up his divided domain into a compact whole, he found that these enclaves of peace became serious obstacles to his success. Henry II in England in his noble attempt to secure fair and even justice for all his people was confronted by the local baronial courts and the Church courts, which by their exemptions and restrictions, prevented his single national system

from being everywhere uniformly enforced; equally was this true in any other general administration, beside that of justice. The local sovereignties, sokes and jurisdictions had been of inestimable value in the days of chaos; they became difficulties in the day of ordered society. The worse the public conditions, the more valuable was the powerful landholder; the better those conditions, the more detrimental to unified society was the power of the lesser barons who held the land.

Consequently the more vigorous kings and rulers who loved justice and desired a peaceful people were precisely those who were most in opposition to the local lords. This conflict between king and baron or king and Church is to be found in the work of Otto I of Germany and Philip Augustus in France; it is to be found no less in the work of Gregory VII or Alexander III or Innocent III, when these popes came to re-establish the government of the Papacy. It was then the paradoxical experience of the West, that the stronger the local lord or the local bishop and almost the finer his work and his organisation, the more likely was he to be found an obstacle to the general recovery of the new Christendom. Hence it is that we notice in this age that its great characters are at war with each other; the nobler their ambitions, the more are they likely to be opposed.

For this reason the chronicles, particularly of this period, are not to be accepted on their own bare statements, either when they praise their own side or when they condemn the other. No imperial or royal account of the pope is necessarily accurate, nor any Papal account of emperor or king. Again, the language of ducal or baronial apologists is as fulsome or as hostile as the apologists of their overlords or of the folk under them. This opposition is clear in the two chronicles of the Fourth Crusade, Geoffrey of Villehardouin's and Robert of Clari's, Villehardouin, who was marshal of the Count of Champagne, and Clari who was a simple Picard knight. This, too, accounted alike for the friendship and the quarrel between Becket and Henry II. The opponents were usually great opponents, their principles were noble principles, their ideals (though on different levels) as fine as the world has known.

These quarrels between empire and Papacy, between the Church and the Normans, between the various leagues of the Italian cities, between royal power and feudalism occupied the energies of all this age, more particularly at its ending. At its close the older organisations had given way to newer organisations, the old feudal groups to nations, in the same way as at its beginning men had woken up to find that the Carolingians had collapsed and the imperial idea had failed. Yet Charlemagne by his conquests, his literary movement, and his friendly relations with the Papacy paved the way along which feudalism rode triumphant; this age of feudalism was made possible by the era of Charlemagne.

UNIFYING POWER OF THE CHURCH

But the power that really unified Christendom at this time was undoubtedly the Church, for the Church was herself the first group to be restored to visible unity and she was so restored because of the popes. Through this long period we have but few General Councils, for the unsettled conditions of public life did not permit them. Had the Church been left to be governed by General Councils she would have failed. It was the Papacy that saved her, all the more remarkable because the popes of this period were numerous (that is, had short reigns), were individually of little importance, some of them flagrantly wicked, only a few of them even approaching greatness. Thus through this critical period of European history there are perhaps four or five only whose names are public names—Sylvester, Gregory VII, who had been Hildebrand, Adrian IV the Englishman, Alexander III, who fought with Barbarossa, and Innocent III. It is evident therefore that it was not the popes, but the Papacy that saved Christendom, not the individual rulers, but the fact of a bishopric, persistent and central, to which men turned as to the divinely appointed source of faith and spiritual power. Degraded though the popes might be in life and character in the first half of the tenth century, the Papacy does not seem to have lost its position even when its influence was lost. It could not control Christendom in the days of its weakness, yet it was never forgotten

or out of men's horizon. It carried always the shadow of a great name. Even when it seemed politically to be at the mercy of an emperor or a band of nobles or a single family, it was still referred to by the Scriptural commentators or the theologians or the Church Councils as the successor to the powers of Peter, the Apostolic See. Its immense position was taken for granted; that is to say, its position was *believed* in, and belief is independent of apparent visible failure, contradiction, or opposition. Individual popes might be despised, but the Papacy was too great to be despised. It alone held all Christendom together; it alone was the visible pledge of Christian unity; it was the only symbol of a common Europe and no mere symbol, but an undying fact. France even under its Carolingian rulers slipped out of the imperial patrimony; it never again acknowledged that the imperial tradition was to be found outside its borders; it even aimed at making itself the empire. Spain again, whenever it recovered its freedom from the infidel, considered itself free of the empire. The only one power each sovereign State accepted was the jurisdiction of the pope. Whenever the East accepted the Papacy, it entered again into Europe; whenever it rejected the Papacy, it was an outside power, aloof, alone. As the influence of the Papacy became more apparent, it naturally strove to shake off its political subjection to whatever power held it down. Its great fight was for political freedom and independence, though sometimes in the heat of the battle a pope might claim a temporal supremacy beyond what was just. But whether it was subject or free or supreme, this political condition was always recognised to be something apart from its spiritual character; and however often its temporal jurisdiction was challenged or even its half-spiritual jurisdiction was challenged, its wholly spiritual work of teaching and determining doctrine was never involved. Under or over other sovereigns in its government, its visible and temporal claims were always in perpetual jeopardy; never (or so rarely as to occasion astonishment) was its doctrinal position in dispute. Even in its worst period, German and Norman kings and bishops refer to it as something divine.

Hence the frequent device of irritated emperors (the setting up

of an anti-pope) never distracted public mind from the position of the Papacy, such dispute as there was only concerned the person, not the office. Even the creation of an anti-pope was itself a tribute to the Papacy; to break the line was evidently unimaginable; all that could be done was to deny the legitimacy of the particular pope who showed himself hostile, either by impugning the election or by urging his forfeiture of the office on account of his evil living or some other accusation. The schism, as to which individual claimant was true pope, never affected men's faith in the thing. A schism might limit papal influence; but lack of influence does not imply or even suggest lack of power or authority; just as disobedience to the popes need not necessarily imply a challenge to the papal rights.

The main points to be noted in this world-wide unification of Christendom produced by the Papacy itself, and its effects on the public history of Europe can be conveniently grouped under five separate heads: the quarrel between popes and emperors over the Investiture Question, Feudalism, Monasticism, Crusades and Culture.

I. INVESTITURE.

The dispute on this point chiefly concerns the three Popes, Gregory VII (1073-1085), Alexander III (1159-1181), and Innocent III (1198-1216). Gregory had already influenced papal policy before his own election to the pontificate; but as pope he was naturally freer in his action. He was enthroned in the Church of S. Peter ad Vincula in 1073 and solemnly consecrated bishop on 29th June 1073, after he had received imperial confirmation from Henry IV. A fat, little, bow-legged man, with a stammer and fine eyes, he carried the glory of the Papacy with a distinction that only his character could have achieved. His policy was anti-feudal; his object from the mere point of view of discipline was much the same as that of the great kings—to reduce the local sovereignties to a general order of justice and good government. In his case he aimed at bringing back the bishops and archbishops to their ordered obedience to the See of Rome. His quarrel with the civil power was partly to achieve this end; he fought temporal power because, by its investing

the local bishops with their spiritual emblems and so merging their ecclesiastical functions in their baronial duties, these were in danger of assuming spiritually and temporally an independence of the Holy See. The supernatural character of Christendom was involved in this contest of the popes. Hence it is to be noticed that in the dispute over investitures—

(i) The local bishops were more often on the royal side.

(ii) The victory of the temporal power over him at his death came too late to protect the bishops from his domination. Canossa did not break the emperor, but its prestige broke the rebellion of the bishops.

In 1075 he held a synod at Rome, and at its sessions this decree was passed: "If any man henceforth receive from the hand of any lay person a bishopric or abbey, let him not be considered as abbot or bishop, and let the favour of S. Peter and the gate of the Church be forbidden him. If an emperor, a king, a duke, a count or any other lay person presume to give investiture of any ecclesiastical dignity, let him be excommunicated."

Henry answered this by a Council of Bishops at Worms in 1076 and there declared: "Thou hast attacked me, a consecrated king, who cannot be judged save by God Himself." To this Gregory made answer a month later in the same year at a council held in Rome, in which he claimed after this declaration of the King had been publicly read by a royal clerk: "As thy (S. Peter's) representative, I have received from God the power to bind and to loose in heaven and on earth." Further he released all the King's subjects from their allegiance and ordered that none should obey him. Canossa is famous as the scene of the King's humiliation in January 1077; for it was there that he came to beg the protection of the Countess Matilda (the heiress daughter of Count Boniface of Tuscany, the most zealous of the papal allies) and Abböt Hugh of Cluny, his godfather, and their intercession with the Pope. After some hesitation the Pope agreed to receive the King, and imposed severe conditions on him as the price of reconciliation. The King accepted the conditions, flouted them afterwards, and in the end left the Pope to die in exile. He even had himself crowned emperor in S. Peter's

in 1084 by an anti-pope of his own making, while Gregory first hid himself in the Castle of S. Angelo; but when Gregory's allies, the Normans, came to his rescue and by their brutal destruction broke the spirit of the Romans, the desolation caused by his friends drove him to follow sadly after them as they retreated. He reached Salerno in 1085, where he died on May 25th. Canossa seems in history a dramatic triumph for the Pope; but in its own time it was hardly more than a gleam of success; its chief importance was in its rallying publicly to the Papal side, and yet making into Henry's advocates, the great figures of Hugh of Cluny and Matilda of Tuscany.

Meanwhile, before this quarrel had very far developed *Anselm of Canterbury* was involved in the same dispute on a smaller scale with William Rufus; the dispute was the same, but the eventual disputants in it were both men less impossible of accommodation, for the death of William II put Henry I on the throne of England, who quickly recognised his need to secure the support of the Church and who therefore soon found with Anselm a way by which the principles of either side could be safeguarded, 1107. The King was to exact an oath of allegiance from the bishops as feudal barons; but he was to surrender the custom of investing them with the crozier and ring, the symbols of their spiritual office. Perhaps the political security of the English monarchs in their smaller dominions allowed them to take a less extreme view of their powers than the emperors could dare accept in their scattered, tumultuous, and divided territories. While Henry I was content with the compromise he had effected, Henry V was extorting from Pascal II concessions which the Pope had ultimately to repudiate, when he found their surrender imperilled the spiritual freedom of the Church.

The quarrel continued along lines which are familiar enough in all imperial and pontifical quarrels to the Reformation, namely councils of bishops, imperial invasions of Italy, the setting up of anti-popes, and the volley of excommunications. But the end of the essential dispute was reached on September 23rd, at the *Concordat of Worms* in 1122, by two short documents which contain in themselves the political theory of the time:

"I, Henry, for the love of God, the holy Roman Church, and of the Lord Pope Calixtus (II), and of the salvation of my soul abandon to God, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and to the holy Catholic Church all investiture by the ring and the crozier, and I grant that in all the Churches of my empire there be freedom of election and free consecration. I will restore all the possessions and jurisdictions of S. Peter which have been taken away since the beginning of this quarrel. I promise to give true peace to the Lord Calixtus and to the holy Roman Church whenever she invokes my aid."

"I, Calixtus, the bishop, grant to thee, Henry, Emperor of the Romans, that the elections of bishops and abbots in the kingdom of Germany shall take place in thy presence without simony or violence, so that if any discord arise thou mayest grant thy approbation and support to the most worthy candidate, after the counsel of the metropolitan and his suffragans. Let the prelate-elect receive from thee by thy sceptre the property and immunities of his office, and let him fulfil the obligations to thee arising from these. In other parts of the empire let the prelate receive his regalia six months after his consecration and fulfil his duties arising from them. I grant true peace to thee and all who have been of thy party during the times of discord."

This was the end of this particular form of the quarrel, and it ended (as these quarrels with a gathering clearness ended through the Middle Ages) in favour of the sovereign, and against those who would break in on his complete supremacy over his own subjects. Hildebrand's claim was the claim of the pope to rule the bishops; the emperor's claim, or the claim of Henry II or Philip Augustus, was the same claim in other terms, namely their right to rule their subjects. The victory of the pope was not and could not well be a triumph over the emperor. So to interpret it is to miss the development of sovereignty in the Middle Ages. Whatever individual popes or kings may have said in the long-drawn-out controversy (when they were heated by personal differences or confused by individual cases of quarrel), the main fact emerges more and more clearly as the centuries pass—namely, the effective primacy of Rome over the whole of the West.

Schisms never prevented this, heresies did but make evident its more piercing need. Indeed, perhaps no man more than Luther so completely made the popes masters in their own house.

The quarrel with the emperors eventually spiritualised the Papacy, divesting it of any claim to the temporal lordship of the world. We shall see the Great Schism ending in the definition of the primacy of the popes at the Council of Florence in 1438, and the Reformation ending in the Council of Trent and its enlargement of the central powers of the Apostolic See, and the nationalism of the nineteenth century ending in the Council of the Vatican in 1870 which defined papal infallibility.

THE STRUGGLE WITH BARBAROSSA AND HENRY VI

Within thirty years of the Concordat of Worms the quarrel was renewed between Frederick Barbarossa (1152-1190) and Pope Adrian IV (1154-1159), the sole Englishman to sit on S. Peter's throne. Adrian had crowned Frederick emperor on 18th June 1155, after his election to that office at Frankfort in March 1152. He was a Swabian, unlike the preceding emperors, who had been Saxons, and he owed his election not a little to his relationship with the Bavarian dukes, the Guelphs, from whose house his mother, Judith, had come. Frederick began his rule with political tact and in 1157 was able to assemble at Besançon a diet which proved the success of his policy of conciliation: he had won Germany to himself by propitiating his feudatories, dividing Austria from Bavaria, creating the Palatinate, and marrying the heiress of Burgundy and thus strengthening his position in the middle kingdom (part of the old division of Lothair) where the later emperors were to find their crucial point of contact with the Powers of the farther West. He had gained also some acknowledgement of his supremacy from the eastern kingdoms of Bohemia and Poland, and from the northern kingdoms of Denmark and England.

But the Pope's legate took the opportunity of the diet to claim for his master some feudal authority over the Emperor. He used words that implied that the Emperor held the empire from the popes. Later Adrian disclaimed any intention of implying this

political subjection of the Emperor, but it is evident that the Pope, an austere, solemn, and dominating character, was certainly afraid of the Emperor's growing successes. Adrian, rejected as a boy in his application to be received as a monk by the Abbot of S. Albans, had turned to the Canons Regular, and by his stern zeal had risen to prominence amongst them; cardinal legate, and then pope, he shrank from no responsibility, but rather sought it as the essential joy of life; the tiara was splendid, he said, "*because it burnt like fire.*" No one was less likely than he to submit in silence to anything which seemed to him an attack upon his powers. Suspicions of such an attack came to him when he saw Barbarossa supreme in Italy, and found him formulating his claim to be the fountain of all feudal rights, the source of lay authority, the supreme governor of all cities, including Rome. Frederick enforced his claim by war, eventually defeating even Milan, the strongest of the northern cities, and carrying off to Cologne from the cathedral the relics of the three Magi in 1162 as a token of his victory. But before anything could happen to bring him into armed collision with the Emperor, the Pope died at Anagni, "mourned by all men," said John of Salisbury, "but most by me." The election of the Pope's successor gave Frederick his chance. Alexander III was the choice of the majority of the cardinals; the minority, who favoured the Emperor, opposed the election (for Alexander III was the very papal legate who in the diet at Besançon had claimed for the pope feudal rights over the emperor) and chose another in his stead. Frederick now claimed the rights of Constantine, Charlemagne and Otto, and declared with exquisite relish that it was for him to decide between the two which was the rightful pope. The tables were reversed on the legate. From whom, was the imperial reply to his question at Besançon, does the pope gain his recognition except from the emperor? Alexander countered, by his refusal to listen to this: "No one has the right to judge me who am the supreme judge of the world."

There were all the elements of a quarrel.

(i) The popes certainly had crowned the emperors, and their coronation of the emperors certainly had seemed needed

before the king, elected by the dukes and prelates, could assume his imperial style and titles.

(ii) The emperors certainly had nominated some of the popes, and others (like Gregory VII for instance) had waited for the imperial approbation before being consecrated Bishops of Rome and therefore holders of the apostolic powers.

The quarrel was not now between Pope and Emperor over bishops and abbots; it was between Pope and Emperor over each other's supremacy.

The common features are recalled all through the controversy, anti-popes and excommunications, invasions of Italy and councils.

The varying successes and failures of either side are not of much consequence; they are interminably dreary, since the fortunes of either side swayed backwards and forwards with desultory results.

These dates, however, are important:

1177 the Peace of Venice and the reconciliation of Frederick and the Pope.

1179 the third council of the Lateran determined the method of the papal election—namely, a two-thirds majority of the cardinals present at the election.

1183 the Peace of Constance, the reconciliation of Frederick with the Pope and the Lombard cities. This last is politically more important than the Peace of Venice, for it involved Frederick's renunciation of his right to appoint the governors of the cities, and with this renunciation disappeared any common effective interference by the emperors in the civil organisation of these rich free cities of North Italy.

It is easy for us who have seen the re-established sovereignty of the pope to understand the political value to Alexander of the independence of Italy as a guarantee to the spiritual power. Frederick, however, still had more wars with the Lombard cities, but his rule grew stronger, especially when he married his son to the heiress of the Norman kingdom of South Italy and Sicily, and so led to the establishment of imperial control over

the part of the Peninsula that had so consistently been in opposition to them.

So strongly entrenched in his dominions was Frederick in his later years that he took the cross in 1188, and could afford to leave his empire in order to assume the leadership of the Third Crusade in 1189. He died in 1190, in Cilicia, at the age of 69, endeavouring to swim the river Salef. Pope Alexander had died on August 30th, 1181.

At the death of the Emperor the point of debate was still left undecided; the great rivals had realised each other's greatness; they had ceased to quarrel, they had not, however, ended the dispute. It was revived by Frederick II.

After Barbarossa, manly, chaste and, despite his ambition and occasional atrocities, noble, came the reign of Henry VI, puny, mean and daring; but Henry had no quarrel with the principles of the popes. Because of his wife's inheritance, he was much more intent on wide schemes of Italian imperial rule. His dreams became realities and he governed his dominions with brilliance and success. He forced Richard of England to admit his supremacy; he conquered South Italy and Sicily; he married his brother Philip to Irene, the daughter of the Greek emperor, Isaac; he even persuaded the diet of Würzburg to accept his scheme of making the empire an hereditary kingdom in 1196. Death alone ruined his cause; with his death, the Sicilian kingdom fell from the German kingdom; and the patrimony of S. Peter no longer lay between the centres of imperial power.

INNOCENT III AND OTTO

Indeed, after his death a disputed election gave the new Pope, Innocent III (1198-1216), the very same chance that Frederick Barbarossa had had, the opportunity for insisting on his right to choose between two claimants and therefore to be the judge of their claims. What was this but in effect to press the right of the Papacy to nominate the emperor? Innocent, however, never quite claimed that. He urged that "no king could reign rightly unless he devoutly served Christ's vicar," but he said *rightly*, and not *lawfully*, precisely because he was too much of a

canonist to claim that the lawfulness of imperial authority depended upon the due service of the pope. "Kings rule over their respective kingdoms, the pope rules over the whole world," was again another saying of his that might sound at first to be a claim to feudal sovereignty. It was nothing of the kind, of course; it was the simple statement of a fact. Royalty was national, Christianity was universal; this was no mere theory, but a visible fact; territory limited princely jurisdiction; nothing but death limited the jurisdiction of the popes over all Christian folk. Even when Innocent III wrote that "the *sacerdotium* came by divine creation, the *regnum* by the device of men," he was again merely saying what most Christian people then believed—namely, that Christ had directly instituted the priesthood, whereas the need for civil government had been discovered and established by men.

When, therefore, a vacancy occurred in the imperial line on the death of Henry VI, and Philip of Swabia and Otto of Brunswick (the nephew of Richard Cœur de Lion) contested the election, the first having been elected by some of the princes at Mülhausen, on March 8th, 1198, the second by others at Cologne, in June of the same year, and both parties appealing to the Pope to settle their respective claims, it is hardly to be wondered at that Innocent III echoed the very words of Barbarossa in the reverse situation and claimed to judge which emperor should rule. There was as much to be said for his contention as there was for Barbarossa's; Charlemagne had settled a disputed Papacy, but equally the Papacy had chosen Charlemagne to be emperor, even (so Charlemagne declared to Einhard) against his will. Innocent III was merely recording history when he said "The settlement of this matter belongs to the Apostolic See, mainly because it was the Apostolic See that transferred the empire from the East to the West, and ultimately because the same See confers the imperial crown."

As will be expected, the German bishops refused to accept the papal settlement; so did the extruded claimant, Philip; so did the various princes involved on Philip's side. Philip's murder in the end gave Otto the final succession; and he used his power

as much against, as for, the Pope. The reason for his opposition to Innocent III was simple enough; he, too, was a centralising ruler who laboured to establish a single bureaucracy of officials, to administer, judge and tax his dominions. To secure this, Otto invaded both the papal territory and the Sicilian kingdom, which had been the heritage of the boy-son of Henry VI (Frederick II as he was to be) in virtue of his mother, the Empress Constance. Innocent III had certainly befriended Frederick always, and he now excommunicated Otto as much for violating Frederick's territories as for violating his own. He released the subjects of Otto from their oaths of allegiance. He even declared Frederick to be emperor in Otto's stead. At Bouvines, on 27th July in 1214, the final battle was fought between the two parties, Otto with the English troops of King John his uncle, his own followers of Holland and Brabant, and the men of Flanders and Boulogne. They were badly defeated by the papal party, Philip of France being Frederick's strongest supporter. It was as the Pope's ally, that Philip joined in and made Frederick II emperor indeed.

THE POPES AND FREDERICK II

Otto survived till 1218, but his power had gone; in 1215 Frederick was crowned emperor at Aachen, in the chapel of Charlemagne, and the new era of Hohenstaufen greatness had begun, the reign of him whom a later age saluted as "the Wonder of the World."

The contest that now opened between Frederick and Innocent was the old quarrel between Church and State,* but complicated by the rise of a new spirit (the spirit of nationalism), restless in repudiation of the temporal claims of the pope; yet though this movement all over Europe was of the new nations against the overlordship of the pope, curiously it first showed itself in the empire, which was far less a single unity than were France or England. Everywhere, however, the same new force was making itself felt. Even poets like Walter von der Vogelweide, with the minnesingers and the last of the troubadors mixed in with their patriotism attacks on the greed of the clergy for temporal

*An interesting set of essays bearing remotely on the subject will be found in A. L. Smith's *Church and State*.

rule. But this was no fair summary of the case, for though the quarrel may have been provoked in part by that greed of some of the clergy, the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal was also at stake. Just as the end of the Carolingians showed the first symptoms of the already living power of feudalism, so these first years of the thirteenth century show the failing strength of feudalism and the beginnings, already vigorous, of the new nationalism.

The leaders in this quarrel were finely matched, Innocent a noble figure, statesman, lawyer and theologian, practical in his own views and generous enough in his sympathy to welcome and direct idealism and enthusiasm wherever it could be secured for the Church; Frederick (1215-1250) with the good looks of his grandfather, tall, fair-haired, ruddy, at once rationalist and mystic, superstitious and devoted to natural history, perpetually querulous over his health yet a keen athlete, a lover of law yet a shameless double-dealer; a writer of careful diction and an impulsive speaker, irreligious, but interested in religion, a Christian emperor, yet a pagan in his state-craft; a genius in military strategy, but a poor soldier, adopting the mode of life of an Eastern Sultan, yet so devoted to bathing as to have it urged against him as a reproach; no less than Innocent III (though in a wholly different way) he sums up in his person the full humanism of the medieval times—its contradictions, its exquisite curiosity, its inexorable logic, its love of compilation, its fascination by the East, its religious interest, its joyous abandonment at any moment to pleasure, poetry and the arts. Victor Hugo summed up this very period in a phrase of which even the exaggeration defined a truth: "It had all the virtues except prudence and all the vices except vulgarity."

Frederick found in his Sicilian kingdom two great obstacles to his government, both typical of that age; he had first to match himself against the feudal nobility so long kept under by the centralising Norman kings, and second the great towns whose liberties also menaced his ideal of rule. Over both he triumphed. Amongst his feudal enemies were the bishops. These, too, he tamed.

His administrative organisation was based upon the old Norman system.

(i) *The Courts General* were a representative parliament, including delegates from districts of his Southern kingdom.

(ii) *The Magna Curia Rationum* had charge of the accounts and fines, and was represented locally by chamberlains.

(iii) *The Magna Curia* sitting at Capua administered the royal justice; its representatives in the Provinces were the *Justices*; its representatives in the villages were the *bailiffs*; its representative, travelling annually through the provinces and villages, was the Grand Justiciar.

It will be remembered that it was through the active protection of Innocent III that his Sicilian territory had been preserved for him at his father's death, and that it was again through Innocent's championing his candidature for the empire that Philip Augustus fought and won for him the battle of Bouvines, which made him Emperor in fact. In return Innocent demanded

(i) That the Sicilian kingdom should be held separately from the empire. This was to prevent the Pope again being squeezed between a hostile and imperial North and South. Frederick agreed, and, to carry out his promise, undertook to enfeoff his son Henry with South Italy as feudatory of the Pope.

(ii) That he should himself embark on the Crusade.

But Frederick had lived too long in the South to wish to move away from it permanently; moreover, he had really little inclination to move off to the Crusade. When *Honorius III* (1216-1227) followed Innocent III on the papal throne, Frederick repudiated both these promises, and though occasionally talking of the Crusade, did nothing to fulfil his oath to join it. At any rate, before anything happened, Honorius died and was succeeded by *Gregory IX* (1227-1241), an old but vigorous pontiff. A Crusade was launched, and Frederick even set sail with it from Brindisi; but fever broke out on the ships, Frederick himself suffering from it, and so back came ships, and Emperor too. Gregory, who did not believe in the reality of this fever, promptly excommunicated Frederick and forbade him to go to the Holy

Land. Equally promptly Frederick retaliated by taking the Cross, and, reaching Palestine, claimed the kingdom of Jerusalem in the right of his second wife (Iolanthe of Brienne), who had just died, leaving him with a son, Conrad. Because of his excommunication the Churches in Jerusalem were barred to him, so he crowned himself in the Holy Sepulchre, and visited the mosque of Omar in order to annoy the Christians still more. Further, he concluded a treaty with the Sultan of Egypt, whereby for ten years the Christians were to hold Jerusalem, Nazareth and Bethlehem on the sole condition of leaving the mosque of Omar in Saracen hands.

Thus he returned to Italy in the character, attractive to him, of an excommunicated Crusader who had done more for the Catholic cause than the most Christian princes had achieved. The most contrary of medieval kings, his enjoyment lay in doing whatever he was forbidden to do, and refusing to do what he was told. His quarrel with the Papacy was seldom about principles, except his general principle never to obey.

The law of heredity, however, disturbed Frederick's calculations, for his son, *Henry VII*, continued against his father the same emancipated régime that his father had practised against the Pope. Frederick promptly made peace with the Pope and crossed the Alps to deal with his son. The son had roused the towns against the feudal princes by giving them certain commercial rights against their lords; Frederick therefore broke the freedom of the towns and gave to each prince "his immunities, jurisdictions, counties and hundreds; both those which belonged to him in full right and those which had been granted out to him in fief."

By this statute (promulgated at Worms in 1231 and at Civitate in Friuli in 1232) Frederick destroyed national unity in the empire in Germany.

(i) Because it gave the princes their independence.

(ii) Because it broke down early town life in Germany, which elsewhere in France and England, for instance, proved to be a valuable centre for linking up national life.

The wilful young Henry after many further revolts was at

last imprisoned (1235) by his relentless father, and when with the high pride of his race he could no longer bear the narrow limits of his prison life, he rode his horse over a precipice and perished (1241).

Frederick's rule seems at this distance of time to have been as foolish in its policy and as suicidal as the rash action of his son. He left the traditions of his house and made peace with England, marrying as his third wife the sister of Henry III. But while German trade increased steadily in volume, since the trade routes through northern Europe went along German rivers and enriched German towns, and while the laws of these cities increased in wise efficiency, and the German language grew in a new-found fluency in verse and prose (inspired by North France and finding in Herman of Thuringia, at the Wartburg, a princely patron), and while on her Eastern borders the march of Christian culture was touching Prussia through the Knights of the Sword and the Knights of the Teutonic Order, and was wielding Bohemia into the strongest of the Slav States, Frederick was too busy interfering with the Lombard cities of North Italy and with the Pope, and too fond of his Sicilian kingdom, its learning, its ease, and his imperial harem, to bother about the new national state that could still perhaps have been erected in Germany; he was the last of those who might really have been universal emperors. Up to his time this was just possible; after his time it was already too late.

Meanwhile a new pope had succeeded Gregory IX; this time a great financier, by name Sinobaldo Fiesco, a professor of law in Bologna; a Genoese by birth and a business man by instinct, who took as his title the name of *Innocent IV* (1243-1254). Quarrels began anew between Emperor and Pope, tiresome quarrels over simple points of little consequence, for Frederick II, a genius if ever there was one, never saw in the Papacy anything else than something to be disobeyed. It was only by chance that he suddenly saw there was a definite policy which he could adopt against the Pope; a large principle which properly developed might carry him far, by rousing against the Papacy the very elements of enthusiasm which Innocent had

used for its support. As a matter of fact it came too late really to serve his purpose; also Innocent IV perhaps alone made it very feasible—Innocent, whose strength and weakness was finance. Frederick gave indeed a policy to subsequent emperors till the days of Joseph of Austria, when he suddenly started the idea that the popes should be poor. It is the only argument that has rallied the finer temper of Christendom against the temporal power of the popes—namely, that the Church should return to her primitive poverty; it is an argument which has this further advantage to the enemies of the Papacy, that it also rallies against it the meaner sort as well. Frederick made his proclamation to the Christian princes: "God is our witness that our intention has always been to force Churchmen to follow in the footsteps of the primitive Church, to live an apostolic life, and to be humble like Jesus Christ. In our days the Church has become worldly. We therefore propose to do a work of charity in taking away from such men the treasures with which they are filled for their eternal damnation." It is hardly possible to take this outburst seriously. It is not easy to suppose that Frederick's sense of humour had left him or even that his sense of Christian idealism had returned.

How popular opinion took this proclamation may be guessed from the fact that it did not even credit him with being a Christian.

Almost his favourite troops were Saracens; almost his favourite city was Lucera, where he lived amongst his grateful Arabs; almost his favourite country house was at Foggia, near the great forests where he loved to hunt and observe the beasts. While he was there he got the news of his military disasters in this new war with the Pope, news also of some success in his abandoned Germany, where the princes to whom he had given their immunities carried on between themselves, in proof of them, a widespread war. Fever came on him; on December 19th he died, 1250, at Fiorentino, not far from Lucera; but it was at Palermo that he was buried. There still is his tomb.

This latest policy that he used to try to break the Papacy, had indeed been in his mind earlier in his life; but though he spoke

of it in 1227, he only adopted it in his last fight. It was too late then for any one to believe in his sincerity; he had been too little of a Christian to pretend successfully in public to be inflamed with a passion for reviving the ways of Christ. But he had shown to later opponents of the Papacy that it was from the plane of idealism that it could be best attacked.

Like his son, but in another sense, he rode over a precipice and perished, and with him perished the last hope of an empire, one and indivisible, touching the whole of Christendom.

FRANCE

There was one thing, indeed, that had from the beginning of the days of Henry the Fowler made the idea of the Holy Roman Empire as a universal monarchy a sham, and that thing was France. Charles the Simple (892-929) had ruled the West Frankish kingdom which he had inherited from his brothers Louis III and Carloman, under the terms of the ancient Treaty of Verdun; he had long been kept out of his kingdom and set aside in favour of Odo, Count of Paris (888-899) the elder son of Robert the Strong, who seized the crown, being only a mayor of the palace and not by any right the king. On Odo's death, in 899, there was a general disorder of fighting till Robert, the younger brother of Odo, was crowned at Sens and held comparatively supreme sway for one year—922-923. After his death, in 923, Charles was put in prison and the Burgundians, who had broken from the East Franks, claimed the crown of the West Franks for Rudolph the Guelph, who had got possession of Burgundy. At his death (936) Robert's son saw that his wiser policy was to allow others to claim the title of king, but to keep the power for himself. When the Burgundian died, therefore, Hugh still refused the title for himself, though his father and uncle had both been kings; he preferred instead to call back Louis Outremer (Louis IV), the son of Charles the Simple, from his exile beyond the seas in England and make him the king. He was crowned at Rheims and reigned at Hugh's pleasure from 936 to 954; then followed the reign of his son, Lothair (954-986), and his grandson, Louis V (986-987). Sturdy and

independent though Louis IV and Lothair tried to be, it was obvious that Hugh, Duke of the Franks, could have turned them adrift at any time. He ruled through them. For the sake of his house he accumulated fiefs and wealth, not only in that Neustria between the Seine and the Loire, whence his family came, but even round Paris, and his power was acknowledged by the feudatories who lived under the suzerainty of the Frankish kings; he lived only to the second year of Lothair, 956. His son, Hugh, later to be known as *Hugh Capet*, from carrying (so legend said) the cope of the Abbot of S. Martin's, gathered up what his father had held in the West, round Paris and in Maine, and added to it by marrying the heiress of Poitou. He allied himself through Gerbert (later Pope Sylvester II) with Otto III, and when the last of the Carolingians died of a broken neck in the hunting-field, Gerbert and Adalbert, Archbishop of Rheims, put forward his candidature for the kingship to the barons of the Western Franks. According to the chroniclers, the two ecclesiastics laid down as a fundamental principle: "We believe that kingship is not acquired by hereditary right, but that we ought only to raise to that dignity the man who is marked out for it, not only by nobleness of birth, but by wisdom, loyalty and magnanimity." By excluding hereditary right, they meant to exclude Charles of Lorraine, the nearest heir, the brother of King Lothair and uncle of Louis V; the proposal was accepted by Church and baronage, and in 987 Hugh was chosen and crowned King of the French. There was need of little enough to mark any change now in the outward appearance of French rule, except that at last the king ruled as well as reigned. But what had been now accomplished was that France had no longer a part in an indivisible empire of Charlemagne, but had started off on its own development and was gradually to achieve its unity and become a State.

But though it did eventually become a unified State, this was not to be yet; Hugh Capet was only a crowned feudatory, elected by other feudatories, and his road was even made more difficult by his own past to him. He had fought for his power against the royal power; he was now to find that when he turned to streng-

then the royal power his late confederates renewed against him their old alliance against royalty. He was, however, to find this also (as had already been discovered by the centralising kings in England), that his great defender, patron and ally was the Church. He was supreme in name over the whole of France, but he ruled absolutely only over his own family territory. However, his central ecclesiastical provinces were loyal to him, and through them he had peaceful, though scattered, domains in Champagne, Touraine and Auvergne. With these definitely secured to the house of Capet, the early successors of Hugh began to make their nominal headship of France a real thing.

The old custom of associating the eldest son with his father in the kingship and having him crowned in his father's lifetime was continued by the Capetians from the old Carolingian empire. The same custom was observed amongst contemporary sovereigns all over Christendom at this time. It was a confession of insecurity of tenure, of fear that the crown might not otherwise descend in the house of the king. The same insecurity, not of succession, but of effective government, was seen in the granting of fiefs to the younger sons, an unwise but apparently inevitable system; unwise because it entailed a persistent weakening of the wealth and direct influence of the monarch; inevitable because it did not appear that there was any other way of providing the lesser royal princes with appropriate revenues.

The French kings managed, however, in spite of their weakness to hold on to their thrones and to increase their power; in this they were helped, partly by rousing their people at intervals to protest against what were thought to be encroachments of pope and emperor, and partly by a tradition of peace with the feudatories in Normandy and elsewhere. But despite all their efforts, these feudatories, whether friendly or not, developed their counties and duchies along their own lines and gave them a separate life, tradition, custom and idealism that secured for them through all their history an individuality of their own. This individuality has survived all subsequent centralising efforts of French monarchies, empires and republics—namely the steady attempts to substitute departments for the older

system of fiefs and provinces, and to break down the real feeling of local nationality that has steadily subsisted in each.

Normandy, indeed, was necessarily a place apart by race and organisation; so again was *Brittany*, which rebuilt its independence of character against the Norman invaders on a base of its inherited traditions, Gallo-Roman and Keltic. *Flanders* also had its obvious racial differences, its strong influence of Germanic speech and custom, its geographical boundaries, its city life, its tumultuous population, which was the most democratic in Christendom in politics and the most religious in art. But there were other provinces which did not appear to have such obvious reasons for their individuality (*Champagne*, *Blois*, *Anjou* and others), and which yet retained it; *Champagne*, for instance, early passing to the house of Blois, but again separating from it, and *Anjou* going off through marriage to the Norman dukes and English kings. In the south there were again other provinces as distinct racially as *Normandy*, *Brittany* and *Flanders* in the north; namely, *Burgundy*, part of the southern survival of the older Middle Kingdom of Lotharingia, but only a part, for the *Arelate* or Kingdom of Arles (which had also been part of it) was now joined to the Eastern, and not Western, Franks, *Aquitaine* and *Poitou* (i.e. the country round Poitiers), which, thus united, combined the langue d'oïl with the langue d'oc, becoming the gift which its heiress, Eleanor, later brought first to France and then to England, and especially *Gascony*, which was related as much to Spanish as to French culture. But this great piece of South Western France had hardly more than a nominal unity, for the Gascon had little conscious fellowship with the subjects of the French king in the north; lastly, the *Toulousain* in sympathy and culture one with *Provence*, the most developed artistically of all these groups of France, developed too early, historians now think, an infant prodigy wasting its sense of beauty (before maturity had brought it prudence), and caring more for art than for man inspired by art.

Out of this jumble of provinces no one then knew a single France would evolve; for there was no reason why they should come under the ruler of Paris, nor any inevitable reason in Paris

why its master should rule them. But here, as in England, the great aid to the monarchy in absorbing these other fiefs was the Church. It was to her advantage to have a peaceful and orderly government, and to see feudalism broken up, and therefore to support larger groups of nations. The desire of the popes was to be popes indeed, and their fear was lest the local bishops by remaining too local might cease to acknowledge the supremacy of Rome. So it happened that popes as well as kings were eager to centralise their powers. In the empire this meant war between an already centralised emperor and the pope, but in France it meant peace through the years of disorder until the king had become an absolute monarch. Then the agreement between pope and king would be broken, and the popes would be found quarrelling with the kings, often, though not always, because the kings advocated an unchristian nationalism.

The first King of France to be really a power was *Louis VI*, called Louis the Fat—so huge in bulk at forty-six years of age that no horse could carry him. (It is not unworthy of notice that the horses which could not carry him were the ancestors of our shire-horses, themselves domesticated from the old European horse; our modern riding and carriage horses are descended from the Berber horses captured in the south of France in the wars between Charles Martel and the Saracens, shorter in the nose than the finer Arab type.)

The chief policy of Louis, a practical warrior, but letting himself be directed by the enlightened statesmanship of Suger, Abbot of S. Denis (the monastery where he had been brought up as a child), was pursued steadily all through his reign from 1108-1137—it set the model for the succeeding kings.

(i) He fought to keep clear the roads that linked Paris with the royal cities of Orleans, Bourges, Sens, Beauvais, Etampes, Senlis and Montreuil.

(ii) He dispensed with the disloyal assemblies of magnates who claimed to direct his policy.

(iii) He put ecclesiastics and simple people of his household into the posts of State administration under him.

(iv) He left the separate fiefs to their self-centred lives.

(v) He gave charters to many of the cities under the control of the bishops and abbots, and did not oppose the growing communes which were governing and grouping the towns.

(vi) He chose his son's wife carefully, giving him Eleanor, heiress of Aquitaine, Poitou, Guienne and Gascony.

This scheme of his failed at his death, for under his immediate successor the feudatories increased their power. The repudiation of Eleanor by divorce threw her vast estates out of the royal ownership and her subsequent marriage with Henry II handed them over to the English crown. Yet through the plentiful mischief-making of Louis VII the evils of the loss were neutralised by the persistent revolts of the English princes against their father. When, in 1180, the King gave place to his son Philip, aged fifteen, the French crown was well established, and, despite the feudatories, in no ill-plight.

PHILIP AUGUSTUS

One curious thing marks the growing certainty of the house of Capet in its great destiny—the little Philip was surnamed Augustus. It was not forgotten that the successors of Charles the Simple had some claim to be legal heirs to the empire of Charlemagne. To show he remembered this, when Philip came to manhood he instituted a court of twelve peers, deliberately encouraging this legendary following of Charlemagne. For this reason, too, he was unwilling to leave the Eastern Franks in undisputed possession of the indivisible empire. It was this fact as well as this claim, that prevented the Holy Roman Emperors from ever becoming the unique leaders of Europe, and the phrases of imperial Rome have equally lingered in the political phraseology of the French. The reign of *Philip Augustus* (1180-1223) began to show the fruits of the patient policy of the French kings. He succeeded to a position which had been already consolidated, a strong central government with feudatories in mutual antagonism and the Norman and English block of territory in revolt against its King over sea. He strengthened his position by his policy in dealing with the Pope, coming into a firm alliance

with Innocent III, which culminated in the victory of Bouvines and its results, and by joining the Third Crusade. His policy was concerned:

(i) With destroying the Angevin hold on the central portions of France. He succeeded in this, partly because of the foolishness of King John, his tyranny, his wilfulness, his crimes and his curious inability for military action in France. John's mother, who was Philip's stepmother, did her best to keep peace between them, but at her death John lost the last wise counsellor to whom he would listen. At once Philip found occasion to quarrel with John and quickly conquered the whole of the Northern territory—Normandy, Maine, Anjou, Touraine, Poitou and the upper part of Aquitaine. In Brittany, which was the murdered Arthur's heritage, he replaced a French line of dukes. The loss of these territories, their transference from England to France, more than any other single act, made France and England into separate nations for the first time since the Norman Conquest, 1066.

(ii) With claiming the Crusade-ridden territory of the Toulouse and its more easterly provinces, still infected by the heresy of the Albigensians. The murder of the legate, Peter of Castelnau, had turned a propaganda by preaching into a "holy war." The Crusade that followed attracted northern nobles like De Montfort, whose success was resented even by the orthodox princes in the south. After the appointment of De Montfort by the legates to rule the territory of Beziers, the rest of these northern nobles withdrew and De Montfort found himself in a country racially hostile to him as well as politically rebellious, and helped by Toulouse and Aragon. His military skill gave him victory at Muret in 1213, and his rule was thereby extended to Toulouse and Narbonne. But after some seven years of rule he was killed in 1218, and the cautious Philip stepped into the breach and undertook to quiet the various factions. Through his diplomacy a treaty was eventually made whereby: (i) the heiress of Toulouse was married to his son, and (ii) her territories, at the death of her father, Raymond II, were to fall to the royal house of France. Thus in

time there fell to the monarchy, in the reign of his grandson, these rich provinces of the South and East.

(iii) With gradually extending his power so as to get into direct relationship with the vassals of his feudatories—it was the policy of Henry II in England applied to France.

(a) He widened the scope of the royal courts so as to include cases hitherto reserved to his barons, and even other cases on appeal.

(b) He encouraged and protected his clergy, but did not acknowledge any feudal power of the pope over him. Innocent III, in settling a dispute between him and Cœur de Lion, stated publicly that he made no claim to judge *feudal* matters.

(c) He allied himself with the communes, gave liberal charters to the towns and encouraged their commerce. (He had his reward at Bouvines where sixteen boroughs sent their troops to his aid.)

(d) He invited foreign merchants into the kingdom, gave them privileges, and undertook to protect the ports from pirates.

(e) He was the real founder of the great medieval Paris, stone-built, stone-paved, the centre of the kingdom.

(f) He was the father of the learning of his time, giving to the schools, scholars and university his royal protection and the first royal charters of their independence.

(g) He met his own extension of the power of the courts by still further developing an official class of civil servants, trained under the royal method and despatched to supervise even the courts of his barons.

(h) He decreed that wherever a fief was divided, each part of it should pay homage to him.

(i) He made the exchequer more careful in its system of audit and book-keeping.

The best tribute to his success in the kingship lies in this, that he was perhaps the first French king who did not need to crown his son during his lifetime. It was clear before he died that his

son would succeed peacefully to the inheritance that now put the King of France above all his vassals in material resources and power.

As it turned out, one of his fruitful actions was to have married his son Louis to the daughter of Alfonso VIII of Castile and of Eleanor (the daughter of the old Queen Eleanor of France and of England—"Queen of England," as she truly styled herself, "by the wrath of God"); the daughter chosen was Blanche, not the elder sister, for the old queen said no princess would ever be popular in France whose name was Urrique. This Blanche was the mother of S. Louis, fame enough in itself, and she begot, not S. Louis only, but much of his policy, his character, and something at least of his idealism and sanctity. Her own days of royalty were soon over, for her Louis—*Louis VIII*—died after not quite three years of rule (1223-1226); but her regency lasted from 1226-1235, and even after her son was master and master indeed, she remained till her death his confidant and counsellor, and sometimes the inspirer of his dreams.

The only fault that Louis VIII committed was apportioning in his will great pieces of the royal domain to his sons, and thus creating trouble later under the Valois, as Edward III created trouble by marrying his sons to the rich heiresses of his day. Yet it was a necessary stage in the development of the country, and certainly even where it weakened the monarchy it strengthened the national—as opposed to the provincial—spirit.

So strongly had the work of Philip Augustus been done that the regency of Blanche, a Spaniard and a woman, was marked by but little encroachments on the royal power; the youth and lack of a clear or steadfast policy of Henry III of England helped her, the jealousies of the great feudatories helped her, the almost constant loyalty of the Count of Champagne helped her; but the Queen herself was fully worthy of her office and magnificently fought her way through all obstacles to her son's triumphant rule. Hard and swift in decision, disdaining no gift of mind, of body or soul, she was certainly more intelligent, more clear-sighted, and more persistent than anyone against whom she was pitted. She did not make France, but she shielded France that

had been only lately made. Under her the treaty was actually made that secured all the Toulousain for the French crown.

FRANCE

In the XIth & XIIth Centuries.
Showing the Continental Dominions
of the Norman & Angevin Kings.



LOUIS IX

The rule of her son *Louis IX* (1226-1270) was wonderful because it was the triumph of a saintly life. He came of age in 1235.

The character of the saint was the perfect fulfilment of the ideal of medieval kingship; he bore in himself all that the Middle Ages preached as the heroic way of Christ. His devotion to the religious teachings of Christ our Lord was fervent; he loved prayer.

The long office in choir was a delight to him, and some of the practices of his private devotion have passed into the liturgy of the Church; it is said, for instance, that it was he who introduced the custom of kneeling during the phrase *Et incarnatus est* in the Credo and after the *Expiravit* in the Passion during Holy Week.

His charity was immense, his munificence in founding religious houses and hospitals and in building churches was indeed royal; his personal attendance on the poor and sick and lepers made good works fashionable. But his age was honest and frank enough to refuse to respond to his enthusiasms when it could not feel them. Once he asked of his faithful bluff friend de Joinville, whose life of him is perhaps the most human of all biographies of saints, whether he would not rather have leprosy of the body than leprosy of the soul; but de Joinville replied immediately that for his part, if choose he must, he would prefer to sin. S. Louis thoroughly enjoyed the sincerity of the answer, though he reproved its bad taste. For the charm of the King's holiness lay exactly in the perfect naturalness of his supernatural life. Fasting as he did most rigorously, he was as even-tempered as those who did not; patient, humble, gentle, he was exact, just, and tenacious of his rights. He hated evil talk, was chaste in word and act, had exquisite refinement of thought, was unsuspicious, charitable and generous: "to see or hear him brought comfort and calm to the most troubled spirit."

He was tall, slim, fair-haired, eyes blue-grey ("dove's eyes" is one of the phrases used by contemporaries to describe them), full of energy, an athlete, a hunter, well formed in limb and muscle, a perfect picture of the medieval knight. His, too, was the shrewd humour that should be the heritage of kings. His innumerable sayings form a scrip of wisdom, whence anyone

could borrow good things for daily use and daily guidance. These are a few of them, showing his affability and his common sense. "There is no such good book as *Quolibet*, or say what you please."

"So dress that your wife will love you the better and the people think well of you."

"Why should I be blamed for spending so long in prayer when no one would criticise me for wasting as much time on hunting or dice?"

"Be always on the side of the poor man rather than the rich—until you know the truth."

But saint as all confessed him to be, he was not left untroubled. In 1242 the south—barons and princes—revolted against him, and Henry III hurried over from England to join in on behalf of the rebels; but Louis triumphed over them in a short campaign and forced his feudalists to submit. He never refrained from vindicating the ordered justice to which he had pledged himself in his coronation oath. Seven years later, after this revolt, the death of Raymund of Toulouse brought into force the treaty of Meaux (1229), whereby the brother of S. Louis, Alphonse, who had married the heiress Joan (1237) inherited for the royal house of France all that remained as yet unannexed of the principedom of Toulouse. Louis now gave his brother the whole of the south so that it might have a single administration, a single supreme court of law, and a unified system of finance. Fortunately, when Alphonse died he had no heirs to succeed him, and this great block of the southern territory was inherited in default by the crown.

His other settlement in the south was on the western side of it, where, by his generous agreement with the English king, surrendering territory in exchange for territory, he acquired Anjou and, even more, Northern Normandy as the unchallenged possessions of the French monarchy.

To the north and centre Brittany and Flanders still remained outside the power of the crown; but the house of Blois held its territory loyally, and even Burgundy acknowledged the French sovereignty when Louis bought Macon and therefore held

territory near enough to let him enforce the carrying out of his general unifying principle. Here, as elsewhere, he was rather the administrator of his grandfather's conquests than a conqueror himself. His last acquisition was the territory of Provence, which fell to his brother Charles of Anjou on marrying the last daughter of Raymund Berengar, Count of Provence; the other three daughters had already married kings:

Margaret, the wife of S. Louis himself.

Eleanor, the wife of Henry III of England.

Sanchia, the wife of Henry's brother, Richard of Cornwall, later King of the Romans.

By this marriage this old centre of medieval culture and art in France fell to the royal house.

The foreign policy of S. Louis was simple and effective. He had settled the English claims on Normandy and Anjou by exchanges of territory; he did the same with Aragon, surrendering Barcelona for the sake of Foix and the county of Rousillon. He was steady in his determination to rule in unchallenged legality over a compact and undistracted kingdom. He married his daughters to the princes of Castile and Navarre. He made every effort to establish peace between the pope and the empire; and again between Henry III and his barons. But though he loved peace and pursued it even by the sword in defence of his legalities, and by legalities in defence of his *de facto* sovereignties, he was as untroubled in war as in peace. For him every war was a Crusade.

Legality was a passion with him. He would not acknowledge the right of the pope to appoint to French bishoprics till he had inquired and found out that this right was admitted in law; he would not attempt to break down by force the claim of England to Normandy till he had been convinced of the rightness of the French claim to it; he could not allow himself to encroach on the rights of his barons because he was not convinced of the lawfulness of taking cases out of their courts to his own. Yet he did nevertheless build up his administration along the lines of his grandfather, perfecting even more thoroughly what he found already established.

A. His advisory council was the royal household (Hôtel du roi).

B. Under this board (which helped, but did not rule, the king) the provinces were governed by (i) the *baillis* (called *Senechals* in the South) who nominated the inferior officers, administered royal justice, collected the royal revenue, repaired annually with their accounts to the royal audit, and kept an eye on the administration of the feudatories in their self-contained courts. (ii) the *enquêteurs*, who were the old *missi dominici* instituted by Charlemagne, and now formed an integral part of the royal legal administration by dispensing itinerant justice after the custom of the justices-in-eyre of the English kings.

C. The board itself did not altogether oust the old royal council, but it enabled the old council to be re-constituted so that the nobles, etc., now formed three great groups:

The *Grand Conseil*, which advised on home and foreign policy.

The *Parlement* which became the legal mouthpiece of the king.

The *Maîtres des Comptes*, which received and audited the royal revenue.

Naturally the council, which was busied with administration and foreign affairs, had to accompany the king if he left Paris; but equally naturally the Parlements and the *Maîtres des Comptes* were not allowed to leave their courts in Paris where they were always needed to be found, especially the *Maîtres des Comptes* who attended regularly at the Temple, part of their duty being to file the records to which reference had so often to be made. S. Louis purified the coinage, enforced the royal monopoly of a mint in his own domains, and forbade his feudatories or towns to coin money which could be mistaken for royal money. Thus gradually his coins pushed out the less perfect coinage of his vassals.

So great a king could not but take up a definite attitude to the greatest power within his dominions, the Church. Here even more clearly were seen his perfect sense of rightness, his absolute

acceptance of the doctrinal and spiritual power of the Papacy, and his sturdy independence of the pope's feudal claims and of papal foreign policy.

(i) He retained his rights of patronage and of temporalities during the vacancy of a bishopric or abbey, appointing carefully the best men he knew.

(ii) He abandoned to the secular jurisdiction all clerks who were married or who engaged in commerce.

(iii) He insisted upon his right to tax the clergy in cases of extraordinary national need.

(iv) He did not accept the deposition of Frederick II by Innocent IV at Lyons on 17th July, 1245.

(v) He would not allow Robert of Artois, his brother, to accept the empire offered him by Pope Gregory IX.

Thus by his attitude at home and abroad, Louis had not only assured himself of a peaceful kingdom where he ruled without let or interference in his last years, but also had pushed France to a commanding position in Europe. Mathew Paris (V.480) speaks of its king as "King of earthly kings, both on account of his sacred anointing and on account of his power and military pre-eminence."

It was obtained—

(a) By the failures of Germany and England (he had no other rivals).

(b) By the strength of S. Louis's own rule over his nobles.

(c) By the vigour of his Crusading leadership.

(d) By the intellectual activities of Paris.

(e) By the encouragement he gave to architecture and the arts.

(f) By the towering sanctity and sanity of his character.

It is strange that he should have established by his holiness a royal power with which his grandson Philip le Bel was to brow-beat the Papacy. The only note of ill-seeming in his life is his curiously remote attitude to his Provençal wife, it is supposed because he had reason to fear her tendency to intrigue. That she was unhappy is clear. That the two had little in common is clear too. That his mother, the great Blanche ("a woman in sex, a

man in counsel," says Mathew Paris) spoilt him for lesser women, is probably even clearer still. Yet it is sad to think that in the centre of his palace life and in his home was almost the only one in his kingdom whom his charm, his righteousness, his wit, his humour and his holiness did not hold absolutely to his confidence and love.

II. FEUDALISM

In this chapter we have spoken repeatedly of feudalism; we must now describe it more in detail, in order to realise the two great forces that had bound up Christendom and held it together throughout this important period. We shall see these forces loosening their hold in the next period and under their weakness the unity, so slowly and so fruitfully achieved, slowly dissolving. We have already treated of the first of these forces, namely the Papacy; we have now to take the second, Feudalism.

A. *Its origin* can be briefly described by saying, (i) it is a universal stage in culture whereby lesser folk commend themselves to greater for protection and for positive development. (ii) in the particular case of Europe in the tenth century these commendations were partly inherited from Roman and partly from Teutonic custom. To neither can the medieval development be wholly ascribed.

B. *Its nature* was that (a), as regards its duties, it consisted in a contractual system whereby the nation (represented by the king) let out its land to individuals who paid rent by doing military service and civil suit; and (b), as regards its rights, it was a land-system whereby "every lord judged, taxed and commanded the class next below him." (Stubbs.)

C. *Its causes* were:

(i) Taxation, falling on impoverished landlords, made them anxious to dispose of their possessions on terms to greater men, and thus resulted in huge holdings which could not be adequately ruled from one centre.

(ii) Royal grants of administration to leaders of character in the interests of good government or to placate jealous rivals, etc.

(iii) An administrative device for making districts responsible for all crimes committed within their boundaries.

(iv) The growing wealth of certain men gave them a hold over their fellows.

(v) War similarly gave to others a predominance, based on skill and success.

D. *Its essence* was threefold:

(i) Territorially it was the grant of enfeoffment by the lord to his man, i.e., land given to a dependant on certain conditions, partly as a reward, partly to ensure for the lord a sufficient following of knights and men-at-arms in time of war.

(ii) It implied a state of vassalage or subordination of the lesser to the higher, wherein the king was the apex of the hierarchy; below him were his barons-in-chief who held directly of him; below them were the ordered ranks of lesser barons holding of the lord immediately above them. This was the old tradition of loyalty to a war-chief translated into a land-system in a time of settled peace.

(iii) It included also the notion of an immunity, i.e. the administration of justice, carrying with it fines and other profits. Hence, besides service in its military sense and in its sense of subordination, there was suit, or the obligation of the vassal to submit to the lord's courts of law and to his courts of council or local parliaments. These courts were of various kinds, for the freeman, for the serfs or villeins as they were called, for criminal cases, for recognition of ownership of lands and of local customs, for the election of offices of the local group, for Church matters, etc.

E. *Its evil results* were:

(i) The central government lost contact with the lesser people and only directly commanded its highest vassals.

(ii) These vassals tended to make their followers obey them even against the central government.

(iii) Their very independence encouraged them to war against their immediate lords and between themselves.

(iv) The entanglement of the Church (which as an owner

of property became a feudalist), from being an arbitrator in a disputed succession, into being a partisan, using her arm of excommunication in purely secular quarrels.

F. *Its good results:*

(i) It supplied a cohesive force when none other was possible.

(ii) It introduced a wide sense of legality where everything was settled by custom and law, and little was left to choice.

(iii) It provided an armed force which saved Christendom from invasions from the east and south.

(iv) It solved for the time two of the perpetual problems of mankind; social organisation and land-system.

G. *Its break up was due:*

(i) To the substitution of money for service—the vassal paid the lord to be excused from military obligations.

(ii) To the Black Death, which forced capital to tempt labour to its aid because of the reduced supply of labour no longer adequate to the demand, and so got labour away from the land to which properly feudalism tethered it.

(iii) To the centralising efforts of the great popes and kings in establishing uniform justice throughout their dominions. The triumph of the middle-class was the overthrow of feudalism; the aristocratically-maintained troubador gave place to the popular poet; land had surrendered to money its position as the chief wealth of the West.

III. MONASTICISM

Besides feudalism, we can consider that the monastic enthusiasms of this period also constituted new bonds of union to Christendom in a way that the old monasticism had not done. We find that the new orders or the reformed branches of the old orders did not any longer continue the policy of regarding the autonomy of the abbey as absolute, but were busy devising schemes for linking up the various houses into a compact unity. *Cluny*—the first of these re-organisations in this period in point of importance—dates its power from the “Customs of Cluny,”

which established it as a congregation of abbeys, under the headship of the Abbot of Cluny, and to which older abbeys joined themselves out of a desire to reorganise their discipline after the model of the Benedictine rule. It seemed to be more likely that fervour would be retained, if a power could be established over each individual monastery which could keep its eye on discipline, and be quicker than a mere local superior to notice that gradual slackening of purpose to which the inconstancy of man inevitably tends. Cluny was founded in French Burgundy in 910. It had a series of great abbots, and then it failed.

Cluny had, however, the merit of introducing more firmly than before the idea of a congregation of houses under a central abbot, of establishing a Chapter General of these lesser abbots to meet at intervals at Cluny, and a system of visitation whereby the Abbot of Cluny or his "missi" had to see that the subsidiary houses observed the rule.

On its public side its political influence was in favour of the separation of Church and State; it was reforming on the side of the Hildebrandine ideals; it gave enthusiasm to the Norman kings.

The *Camaldolese* (founded by S. Romuald in 1012), and the *Vallombrosians* (founded by S. John Gualbert in 1038) were both orders of hermits, but were orders in the new organised sense; so again were the *Carthusians*, founded by S. Bruno near Grenoble in 1084, hermits also, but linked up with other houses of hermits across the margin of the world.

Especially, though a little later in reaching its fulness, we have the order of *Citeaux*, which had its beginnings not far from Dijon and was, like the Cluniac movement, Burgundian; its real beginnings date from the establishment at Citeaux of a band of monks under Robert of Molême who were anxious to carry out in its austerity the full rule of S. Benedict. Besides Robert, Stephen Harding, an Englishman, was also responsible for the organisation of the order. It was Stephen who composed the *Carta Caritatis* or Charter of Charity, which laid down the principles of the new foundation:

- (i) Poverty in food, building, and Church-worship.

- (ii) Remoteness of site.
- (iii) Agricultural work, and not the study of the clerical sciences.
- (iv) Co-ordination of all monasteries under Cîteaux in Chapters General.
- (v) Annual visitation of every monastery.
- (vi) Correction of the Abbot of Cîteaux by the abbots of four oldest daughter abbeys.

Ultimately this organisation was discovered to be so successful that in 1215 the Council of the Lateran imposed it on the Benedictines as well, and commissioned the Cistercians to attend the General Chapters of the Black Monks till these had learnt how they should be conducted. From this date come the Benedictine "Congregations," or groups of abbeys, which to some extent limited the autonomy of the individual abbey by binding it to a general series of customs and regulations.

No doubt it was the splendour and activity of S. Bernard that gave the Cistercians subsequently so great a power; their abbeys spread everywhere, their agricultural success brought them immense wealth; indeed, the wool-trade of England was so largely in their hands, that English kings could avoid calling Parliament for votes of money, by taxing each sack of wool that left the wolds of their great Yorkshire sheep districts.

Again, there were the *Canons Regular*, who accepted the rule of S. Augustine (an artificial rule made up from two letters of Augustine), who had aimed at combining the cloister and the parish and at giving to parochial life the unity and the sanctification of monasticism. The chief of these groups of Canons were the abbey of S. Victor, outside Paris, which specialised in theology and mysticism (its leading writers were Hugh, Richard and Adam), the Abbey of Premontre under the guidance of S. Norbert, which especially undertook parochial work, the Hospital of S. Bernard in the Alps, which had the care of souls and bodies high up amidst the snows. All these Orders, it needs to be repeated, were international, and thus linked the whole of Christendom into fellowship.

As a final development we have the *Friars*. Their principle of

life was not to live remote from man, but in man's midst, in the ecclesiastically-denuded towns. The Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, Servites and Austin Friars were all part of this new movement, and, though there were differences between these five, they agreed in the main lines of their religious organisation:

- (i) They had one General Superior.
- (ii) They were divided into provinces which almost coincided with national boundaries.
- (iii) Each province consisted of nationally linked friaries.
- (iv) The friaries were almost wholly in the towns.

They were therefore, perhaps, more than any other religious or political group co-terminous with Christendom and could be moved, and were moved, all over the world; Duns Scotus, the English Franciscan, lies buried in Cologne; Aquinas taught in Cologne, Paris, Rome and Naples; S. Vincent Ferrer, a Spaniard, preached all over Europe and died in Brittany; a hierarchy of Franciscan bishops was established in the thirteenth century in China: "The world was their home and the ocean their cloister."* They therefore were able to bridge the continents of the then known world; moreover, everywhere they went they felt themselves to be especially bounden to the popes. They had received privileges and exemptions from the Holy See; they owed their wide organisation to its fostering care, consequently the friars were for long the champions of the Papacy wherever they were found.

Curiously parallel in chronology with these various orders of monks, hermits, canons, and friars were a succession of men who also strove variously to recall Christendom to the ideals of Christ. Heretics some of them became, schismatics others, or only at last reconciled to authority after having strayed away. Also there was at the time a mass of popular eastern philosophy, a wild asceticism that wanted to make compulsory on everyone the austere counsels of Christ, and would even have gone further and denounced all material things as evil—food as well as property, marriage as well as the pomp of power. The effects of this

*For the lives of the founders of the friars, the most accessible books are Fr. Cuthbert's *S. Francis* and Fr. Jarrett's *S. Dominic*.

madness stirred popular feeling; if marriage was wrong, then it was no better than concubinage, and concubinage no worse than it. Hence, though the teaching seemed ascetic, it acted in large measure as a solvent of morality in ordinary people. The leaders were men of great austerity; their followers, who could not aim at the impossible standard set them, saw in its impassioned attacks on Catholicism reason enough for breaking with impunity from the old ethics. They could not be denounced by these leaders at least for rejecting the standard set by the Faith.

Lawless, in fact, they were seditious in teaching; hence the civil power was as much antagonised as the religious. It was both that put down the Albigensians, the Cathari, the Waldenses, etc., and that did to death Arnold of Brescia.

IV. THE CRUSADES

A fourth force that made for the unifying of Christendom was the succession of the Crusades.

I. *The First Crusade* (1096-1100) was undertaken because pilgrims were no longer free to visit the Holy Land after the arrival of the Seljukian Turks and their destruction of the Fatimite Caliphs in Jerusalem and their capture of the Holy places. The Fatimite sovereigns had been kindly in their treatment of Christians; the new comers were not. Moreover, they began to threaten the Eastern Empire which, forgetting its schism, now turned to the West. Urban II received these envoys of the Emperor Alexius at the Council of Clermont, 1095, and his preaching was the opening up of the Crusades. The leaders who responded to his call were chiefly French and Norman (Stephen of Blois, the father of King Stephen of England, Robert of Normandy, the eldest son of the Conqueror, Godfrey of Boulogne or Bouillon, Baldwin his brother, and Bohemund, the son of Robert Guiscard and Tancred his nephew) and the papal legate was Adhemar, Bishop of Le Puy en Velay. They went to the Holy Land through Constantinople, secured Antioch in 1098, Jerusalem in 1099, and Ascalon a month later, in August 1099. Its results were:

- (i) A third of Asia Minor returned to Alexius.



(ii) An Armenian kingdom was established in Cilicia.

(iii) The Christians were strong enough in Syria under Bohemund, who became Prince of Antioch, to threaten Egypt and Persia.

(iv) Edessa was created a lordship under Baldwin.

(v) Godfrey of Boulogne was made Advocate of the Holy Sepulchre, having refused the title and crown of a king.

The real established peace of Palestine came after Godfrey's death in the reigns of Baldwin I and his immediate successors.

A feudal state was built up, Edessa, Antioch, Tripoli and Jerusalem being the four Provinces, and each having under its prince lordships deliberately planned on the political theory of feudalism.

(i) Tenure was by constant military service.

(ii) Fiefs were not to be allowed to accumulate in a few hands, lest the supply of knights should become diminished.

(iii) A central feudal court was set up and the normal feudal officers.

(iv) A customs revenue was imposed, the only revenue of the kingdom.

The support of the Latin kingdom came, however, chiefly, in a few years, from the Knights Hospitallers who changed themselves from being merely dedicated to the sick and pilgrims into a military order (1130), and the Knights Templars, who were never anything else but warriors (1128).

II. *The Second Crusade* (1147-1149) followed quickly on the first, and was due to the fall of Edessa (the most northerly of the four principalities) under the attacks of the Emir of Mosul in 1144. S. Bernard now took the place of the Pope as its preacher, and began his impassioned crusade in 1146 at a gathering of Vezelai. The Crusade inaugurated by him was led by far more important people than the last, Conrad the Emperor and Louis VII of France and his wife Eleanor of Aquitaine. But it was badly directed and it badly failed, both armies being discomfited; indeed, the only result achieved was the unity of Islam, which had been previously divided, this unity following on the injudicious attack by the new Christian armies on the emirs who had hitherto favoured the Christians.

III. *The Third Crusade* (1187-1192) was occasioned by the victories of Saladin,* nephew of the Emir of Mosul, who pushed forward his arms till Egypt fell to him, and who then holding Aleppo and Damascus, marched on Jerusalem, which he captured on 2nd October 1187; he took prisoner Guy, its king; and the true Cross as well as the Holy Places were once again in infidel hands. The knowledge of this loss fired Christendom. The

*For a Mohammedan account of the Crusades by a contemporary read *the Autobiography of Ousama* (d. 1188) in the Broadway Medieval Library.

Papacy led the movement for a new Crusade, but the peoples of the West and the princes were stirred to enlist of themselves. Barbarossa moved first in 1189, only to die in Cilicia at the age of sixty-nine in 1191. After his death his German army broke into separate bands, lost the bones of the great emperor which they were treasuring, and was destroyed piece-meal. The kings of England (Richard I) and of France (Philip Augustus) then led their armies across on the Crusade; but there was little unity between them either in spirit or action, Richard dawdling over Sicily and then Cyprus, capturing Messina, "quicker than a priest could chant matins," to avenge his widowed sister, Joanna, whose succession in Sicily had been set aside by the nobles in favour of Tancred, King Roger's grandson. The first act of the kings, once they were set in motion, was to relieve Acre, where the ransomed Guy was holding out against Saladin. Soon after this Philip retired home, leaving Richard to settle the quarrels of the Crusaders—Richard, who was usually more likely to inflame quarrels than to quiet them. But Richard was no mere boisterous fighter against the Saracen, his fighting of the battle of Arsouf revealed him as the tactician who had found the only way of dealing with the Saracen light troops and of enabling the armoured knights in a hot country to use their armour with effect. It was a contribution to the art of war. Richard, however, gained respect and prestige rather than lasting victory. He obtained from Saladin the cession of Jaffa and free entry for all Christians into Jerusalem, and then turned home. He would not, like his companions, climb the hills to see the far view of the holy city he had been unable to recapture. Reserved for the spite of the Duke of Austria, the donjon, and the romantic discovery of Blondel, he left Palestine in October 1192; the next year Saladin died. The real results of the Crusade were:

(i) The possession of Acre as a fortified entry into Palestine and a jumping off ground to protect Christian pilgrims, if need be, by arms.

(ii) The founding of the Lusignan house as Kings of Cyprus (Richard's generous gift of his wife's kingdom to Guy of Jerusalem, whose own possessions were no longer in Christian

hands), which forged a link, military, cultural and religious, between East and West. For this house, later, S. Thomas Aquinas wrote his *De Regimine Principis*, a book on princely government, town-planning, etc.

IV. *The Fourth Crusade* (1202-1204) was due, not to any immediate Eastern disaster that befell Palestine, but to the growing weakness of the Byzantine Empire and to the heroic energy of Innocent III. Its leaders were Theobald of Champagne (who died before it left Europe) with his marshal and chronicler, Geoffrey of Villehardouin, Count Baldwin of Flanders, Count Louis of Blois and Simon de Montfort. The Venetians joined in as a commercial and political speculation, and succeeded in diverting it first to the conquest of Zara, which belonged to the King of Hungary, who had also taken the Cross. De Montfort was one of the few who protested; but Zara fell in 1202. Meanwhile, Boniface of Montferrat had become leader of the expedition and he next turned his attention to Constantinople, where a palace-revolution had driven out one emperor (Isaac II) and substituted for him another of the house of Angeli, his brother Alexius III. The skill of the Venetian ships effected the capture of Constantinople, the deposed emperor and his son were restored, the usurping emperor escaping to Thrace. The capture of the city was possible, because for the first time the Byzantines had lost command of their sea.

But though the Latins refrained at first from plundering the captured city, their presence was disliked by the inhabitants; a new revolution established a new usurper, Alexius V (called Murzuphlus on account of his shaggy eyebrows), who did his best to shut the city against the Latins, and so provoked a new capture and an orgy of destruction and plunder which made Innocent III furious at this wanton attack on Christians and this betrayal of the Crusade. But the Franks and Venetians, calmly undeterred by papal displeasure, proceeded to elect a Latin emperor and a Latin patriarch for the Eastern Empire; Count Baldwin of Flanders was elected emperor and crowned in S. Sophia, and Thomas Morosini was chosen patriarch. Boniface of Montferrat was made King of Thessalonica, Louis of Blois

Duke of Nicæa and Nicomedia, Villehardouin Prince of Achaia, and others given the titles of Counts of Athens, Thebes and Corinth. Further, the Venetians secured as their share of the booty a quarter of Constantinople, many islands, a long coast line including Epirus and Albania, and the island of Crete. Meanwhile, the lesser knights quarrelled with their princes and amongst themselves; the account of the Crusade written by one of them, Robert of Clari, should be read as a corrective of Villehardouin's more noble tale. Both this division and the feudal state now established were not only unstable, but could not be made to fit in with the Byzantine traditions. Only the pressure of the Tartar invasion under Genghiz Khan (d. 1227) kept Islam from combining to destroy the new Western States. But the Bulgarians attacked the Latins, capturing the Emperor Baldwin and putting him to death in 1204; in 1207 they defeated and slew Boniface of Montferrat. For some little time the Latins kept their places to be ultimately ousted by the Greeks under Michael Palæologus, who displaced the descendant of Murzuphlus as emperor in Nicæa and recaptured Constantinople in 1261. The house of Palæologus now held Constantinople till its fall under the Turkish attack in 1453, no mean achievement! for they held it for a longer period than the Plantagenets held England. For two hundred years they saved Christendom from the Turks.

Gradually the conquests of the Latins were absorbed by the Greeks or by the Seljukian Turks, save the Ionian Isles, Crete, and parts of Cyprus; except for titles of Eastern origin continued for many centuries by the Western nobility and the gold dragon on the spire of Ghent, which still flaunts its Byzantine origin, nothing of that false Crusade survived.

V. *The Fifth Crusade* (1217-1221) was preceded by the famous Crusade of 1212, the Children's Crusade, assembled by Stephen, a shepherd boy from Verdome, which merely swelled the slave markets of the East. In the Fifth Crusade itself the Kings of Hungary and of Armenia in 1217 joined forces with John de Brienne, who, as stepfather and guardian of the sons of Queen Mary of Jerusalem, claimed the title of King of Jerusalem. But even these joint armies were not strong enough to engage

the enemy; and the kings seeing nothing was to be gained as yet went home. Later, others came to John's rescue (an English force under Robert Fitz-Walter and the Earls of Winchester, Arundel and Chester), and in November 1219 Damietta was captured from the Mohammedans. These last were now frightened and offered to surrender Jerusalem, if Damietta were returned to them, meanwhile building a great fortress at Mansourah to protect Egypt from Christian attack. The offer was refused and the attack launched; it was defeated, and Damietta had to be given back again as the price of the army's safe return.

John de Brienne's daughter had meanwhile married the Emperor, Frederick II, who finding himself banned by the Pope, promptly conducted a Crusade on his own account, persuaded the Sultan of Egypt to accept his terms in 1229 and secured for ten years possession of Nazareth, Jerusalem and Bethlehem, on the sole condition of the Mosque of Omar remaining in Saracen hands. Frederick now crowned himself King of Jerusalem, returned to Acre and went home. But he could not rule his kingdom at a distance, and only the disputes of the enemies of the Cross saved the Christian name. The French Crusade under Theobald of Champagne, King of Navarre, in 1239 and the English Crusade under Richard of Cornwall, who had always too much money and too little consistent policy to achieve much effect (though he was assisted by Simon the Younger, Count de Montfort and Earl of Leicester), in 1240; both failed to do more than protect what still remained.

VI. *The Sixth Crusade* (1248-1254) was due to the fear produced by the defeat of the Christians and Saracens by the Charismain Turks, whom Genghiz Khan had dislodged from Persia and whom he sent marauding West. At Gaza, the military key, as always, to Jerusalem, the Saracens fled, the Christians were annihilated, and Jerusalem delivered up to massacre. The reply of Christendom was the Crusade of S. Louis from Aigues-Mortes to Cyprus and Egypt; Damietta was captured at once in 1248. Then, after some delay, Alphonse of Poitiers and William Longsword of Salisbury arrived with reinforcements. Again, as in the earlier Crusade, Mansourah was attacked; again the Christians

were overwhelmed, even S. Louis captured, while many of his nobles and followers were slain. Damietta had again to be restored; and though on his release after ransom the King was offered safe-conduct to the Holy Sepulchre, like Richard he refused to see the city he could not restore.

This Crusade had again failed because the Christians quarrelled amongst themselves, the two trading republics of Venice and Genoa fighting for the commerce of the East and crippling themselves and every Christian endeavour for the most selfish reason of fear of losing their trade.

VII. *The Seventh Crusade* (1270) was organised as soon as Christendom saw that it needed to be protected from the Mameluke conqueror, Bibars, whose attacks on the Crusading States had been increasingly successful. In 1268 he captured Jaffa and then Antioch, leaving little else than Tripoli and Acre in Christian hands. S. Louis again became the champion of Christendom, only, however, to turn first to Tunis, since Bibars had meanwhile made an alliance with Charles of Anjou and used Charles to persuade Louis to leave Syria alone. Louis on arrival was blockaded in his camp near Tunis, and died of fever. Even before the expedition left France, his crusade had seemed to be of such little use that the faithful Joinville had refused this second time to accompany him. The King died on August 25th, 1270, without his biographer to watch him and with only rumour to carry home the story of the ending of that perfect knight. Louis's son accepted an offer of tribute from Tunis and broke up the Crusade. Edward, not yet King of England, sailed on to Acre, refusing to be a party to the treaty of Tunis. At Acre he found again that Charles of Anjou had effected another treaty with Bibars, which was advantageous only to the infidel. It was merely an armed truce. Edward, now king, refused to be a party to it, escaped assassination by the legendary heroism of Eleanor of Castile, and turned home. After this the Crusades were over till Pius V fought the Turk at Lepanto. The action of Charles of Anjou in coming to terms with the infidel showed how the temper of Europe was no longer favourable to this sort of religious enthusiasm.

The effects of the Crusades were:

- (i) To hold up indefinitely the attack of Islam on the West.
- (ii) To hold together in a common adventure all parts of Europe in the cause of the Faith.
- (iii) To develop the art of navigation and of shipbuilding.
- (iv) To accustom moneylenders to lending money for longer terms.
- (v) To introduce Greek and Eastern influences into Western art and literature.
- (vi) To give Europe the undying memory of a spiritual romance.

SPAIN AND THE MOORS

There is one other Crusade to which we must now turn, the Crusade to free Spain from the Moors. It will be remembered that the failure of Charlemagne's expedition was only compensated for by the county of Barcelona, which survived the wreck of the fortunes of the Faith; to the west of it was the little principality or kingdom of Navarre. South of these and between them were various Moorish States, of which the principal centred round Cordova, full of culture, wealth, and splendour, where Jew and Christian ministered to the glory of its caliphs. It must be remembered in passing that the Moors and Arabs have originated little enough of the arts. They have always been apt learners. Their architecture was inspired from Byzantium, their philosophy from old Greece, their poetry from Persia; but their sense of colour has enabled them to develop and, above all, enrich the ideas and achievements of other races. But politically Moorish Spain showed at this time little but disunion and decay. The return of the Faith begins with Sancho the Great (970-1035), who began by conquering the other Christian states and took the title of emperor, a heritage from the legend of Charlemagne. At his death he left to one of his sons, Remiro, that district out of which Aragon was to develop; another, Ferdinand, absorbed Leon and held Castile. His successor Alfonso VI (1065-1109), whose vassal, Ruy Diaz, the Cid (1040-1099), lives more wonderously and more loyally in legend than he did in life, took

Toledo and roused against himself the Moslem world. The Moors, indeed, were so frightened that they invited in to their aid Yussuf, the leader of the Berbers of the Sahara, called the Almoravides, who had overrun with their religious fanaticism the Mohammedan kingdoms of Africa. The success of these allies was evidenced in the battle of Zallaca (1086), when Alfonso, though reinforced by Aragon and Navarre, was utterly defeated by Yussuf; but this success (quite as much as the success of the Christians would have done) frightened the Moors, who had no mind to be ruled by the barbarous Yussuf. The effect of the victory was so little pushed, therefore, that Alfonso and the Cid were able to move south, both westerly to Lisbon and easterly to Valencia. These advantages, however, were again lost when Yussuf had conquered his fellow Moors and massed his subject armies against the Christians. But the death of Yussuf ended the terror for a time.

After Castile, Aragon took the leadership of the Christians and moved south along the eastern coast; in 1147 Lisbon was recaptured by Alfonso, Lord of Oporto and Coimbra, who, after the battle of Ourique, had taken the title of King of Portugal in 1139. The Knights Templars and Hospitallers joined this Crusade, as did other knights from England and France. To further the Crusading spirit, the Spaniards not long after created military orders of their own, the Knights of Calatrava and of S. Julian or Alcantara; while the Portuguese founded the order of Evora—all under the inspiration of Cistercians. Also the order of Santiago of Spain was established under Innocent III.

Meanwhile the Almoravides were themselves attacked by another fanatical wave from the south, the Almohades, who not only defeated the Almoravides, but by holding up the Spanish forces were able to delay the Christians' reconquest of Spain.

However, in 1212, on July 16th, at Las Navas de Tolosa, the combined forces of Castile, Navarre, Aragon and the knights destroyed the Moors so utterly that within fifty years all that was left of Spain in Moorish hands was the Kingdom of Granada.

Aragon under James I (1213-1276), who succeeded his father after the battle of Muret, when Peter fell fighting for Toulouse

against de Montfort, Castile under S. Ferdinand (1214-1252) advancing to Cordova, Seville, Xeres and Cadiz, Portugal reaching its modern limits in 1262, consolidated these conquests. The great names that should later be remembered are Alfonso X the Wise of Castile (1252-1284), Alfonso III of Portugal (1248-1279), who built up slowly a fine, compact, and rich kingdom, and Peter III of Aragon (1276-1285), who played his part in Italy against the Papacy itself.

The Spanish kingdoms have these things in common:

(i) They gave the Church an even greater position than she had elsewhere.

(ii) They had a more feudalised nobility.


(iii) They introduced a representative element of the towns in their national assembly earlier than elsewhere in Europe.

(iv) They made an attempt to codify their political theories in the various legislative documents, like the *Siete Partidas*, or Six Divisions, of Alfonso the Wise.

THE NORMANS

It will have been noticed that the great weapon of the Crusades was a single nation, for the advent of the Normans in Europe was fruitful of consequences far-reaching and almost revolutionary. They were of the same creed as the Danes. They came first to harry and plunder, and their delight was to destroy the places of religion and to rifle the shrines; for the centres of worship in those ages were the centres of culture and the centres of wealth. It was the wealth of the Churches that lured the Danes. But though they attacked Ireland, England, Germany, France and Italy with terrible devastation, once settled in a district they were speedily converted to the Faith and became at once more zealous than their opponents had been in the development of religion and culture.

Though they came by sea in their great ships, they were not sailors but landmen; they were not rovers but settlers; they were the makers of the countries they won. But they had little power of endurance; they mingled easily with other races. It was not long before they had ceased to be thought of as a separate race.



As Danes they plundered England, were converted, conquered England, were melted into the general life of the country, and fought their own breed when it came over later under the name of Normans. To these Normans England owes the beginnings of her architecture, her "second spring" of civilisation, the power of organisation, reborn religious zeal, and a love of law. Peaceably under Edward the Confessor, forcibly under William the Conqueror, this recasting of English life reformed the national life.

In France, after years of plunder, the Danes were given at last the land now called Normandy; Rouen was their capital, still showing a fine tribute to their power by its cathedral, its abbey for monks, founded by William the Conqueror (where his thigh bone is all that his tomb holds of him), and another by Matilda his wife (whose tomb remains untouched) for nuns and the wide countryside that shows in ruined or still living church or castle or town the great reconstructing power of the race. Caen and Bayeux, Jumièges, S. Wandrille, the castle at Falaise, are still monuments of a great people; yet their greatness soon suffered eclipse.

In Italy their power lay chiefly in the south, in Naples and Sicily, and again over sea beyond to the east of the Adriatic. Their great leader was Robert Guiscard, strong and fierce, with religion in its most amazing forms holding him. It is the Normans who built the feudal Latin kingdoms of the Holy Land

and it is the Normans of Sicily who were chiefly responsible for the Crusades. They had entered Italy opposed by the emperors of East and West, and the pope; they defeated the forces of all three in 1053, captured the pope and promptly became his vassal. Everywhere they went they conquered, re-organised and disappeared.

IRELAND

There was just one country in Europe where they failed, and that country was Ireland. Its years of serene greatness had closed before these Danish invasions began in real earnest: before 795, when Colgn the Wise, of Clonmacnoise, the greatest scholar then in Ireland, died, Alcuin, once a pupil of the same abbey, wrote to his friends in the abbey complaining of the scarcity of news from Ireland. Offa and Charlemagne, his patron, were at odds, and he could have no direct communication with England, but Ireland, however, was still part of Europe; why then was there silence? The answer was simple enough. The Danes had already begun to destroy. After years of intermittent failure and success, they were met by Brian Boru, a great soldier and a statesman, whose traditions were European; *Imperator Scotorum* he called himself, and was. At Clontarf, though the Irish conquered in the greatest of their battles against the Danes, Brian and his son were slain; it was Good Friday, April 23rd, 1014. Within fifty years the same Northmen, after a sojourn in France, conquered England; their bishops and statesmen tried, after the Norman fashion, to spread their power over the sea to Ireland. Through S. Anselm of Canterbury, an Irish friend of his, Gilbert, was made first papal legate in Ireland; the dioceses were re-organised in 1110 and the Norman influence had begun to be felt. To S. Bernard, over in France, the new spirit introduced by S. Malachy into Ireland was praised and welcomed; in Europe at least it had been reported that religion in Ireland had become much relaxed; now it was being restored: "barbarous laws disappear, Roman laws are introduced." It was not strange, therefore, that when Henry II applied to the English Pope, Adrian IV, for leave to conquer Ireland, his enter-

prise should have been thought of by the Pope as "enlarging the borders of the Church." To the rest of Christendom the rumours of Ireland that reached them, passing through hostile countries, showed the island still suffering from the Danes. The Pope knew well enough that the Irish had been Catholic longer than his own people, but he accepted the common belief of Europe that the Danish wars had destroyed in Ireland, not the peace only, but the culture and religious discipline of the Faith. He saw the benefits which Norman rule had already brought to his own Anglo-Saxons, and he hoped that the same benefits were needed by, and would be conferred on, the Irish people as well. Actually, most had already been effected when Adrian IV intervened.

But when the Normans came to Ireland they never achieved that complete military success which alone elsewhere gave them the chance to organise and stimulate public life; nor were they ever defeated as completely as the Danes had been at Clontarf. The incompleteness alike of their success and defeat was fatal to Ireland's history. But there were other reasons for failure:

(i) The Normans came over from Wales, at the request of King Dermot of Leinster, who promised his daughter in marriage to Strongbow (Richard Fitz Stephen) in 1170 and with her the succession to his kingdom. Feudal law allowed such a transaction; brehon law did not. Though the Normans could not have known it, the treaty was void.

(ii) There was no recognised head in Ireland to whom Henry could claim to succeed; no great Irish defeat, had any occurred, could have given him (as the battle of Hastings had given his great-grandfather) the crown of a conquered race.

(iii) The Irish Channel was broad enough to make expeditions difficult, not broad enough to force the settlers to assimilate themselves to the country in which they landed. They could always go home.

(iv) The continued absence of the crown from Ireland (only one king [Richard II], between the reign of King John [1209] and of King William III [1690], visited Ireland).

(v) The absenteeism of the Norman lords who put in Anglo-

Norman bailiffs and quartered on their tenants by "coin and livery" bands of Irish mercenaries.

(vi) The English kings and officials looked on Ireland only as a place where money was to be obtained; even the bishops appointed to Irish sees were nearly always English and seldom resided in Ireland, and, when they did, had little sympathy or interest in their Keltic priests and people. Even the feudal law was never wholly enforced, even in the districts conquered by the Normans; it was only administered when it was to the Norman advantage to do so. Else they were content to follow the brehon law. This expedition of the Normans failed badly, even though at first it seemed to have some measure of success; but it failed most of all because of the disregard for the Irish shown by the Norman kings. Almost to the end the Irish were not treated as equals. As a whole the Irish have welcomed great men to rule over them. In Ireland Henry II was never great. The Irish who accepted him, kings, princes, people, were as badly treated by him as those who revolted against him; the treaty of Windsor (1175), by which Rory O'Connor recognised Henry as his liege lord and Henry recognised Rory as King of Connaught, was violated by royal authority and the power of the De Burghs in that kingdom was established by royal grants. Sporadic war followed, the Irish and Anglo-Normans divided into factions, no combinations being stable; for the Irish never ceased to resist, the Normans never managed to agree. There was but one gain which Ireland owed to the Northmen, the increased strengthening of the towns. The towns in Ireland had been built by the Danes, they were fostered by the Normans, but they were restricted in their commerce by the jealousy of the English trade.

V. CULTURE

Lastly, after the Empire, the Papacy, the Crusades and Feudalism, we must briefly consider Culture as a centralising force in Christendom, for it was as international as feudalism, and almost as single-voiced as the Church.

The culture of the eleventh and twelfth centuries was human-

istic, of the thirteenth century was scholastic;* the earlier centuries show us the fruits of the re-organisation under Charlemagne and the Benedictines; the survival of the classics, which had filtered through S. Gregory and the great writers of the Faith. They did not denounce secular learning, but considered the time given to it wasted in an era which was busy over things more necessary to the development of man. Hence S. Gregory and his followers only attacked grammar when its niceties stood in the way of getting truth home to their hearers. We can follow the classical tradition, however, as it was continued through Gerbert of Aurillac (1003) (later Pope Sylvester, taking that name in memory of the old imperial dreams), through S. Gall and Richenau and Rheims, descending from Rabanus Maurus (835) and the learning of encyclopædists. Then came the second period, opened by *Lanfranc* (1089) and *Anselm* (1109), the latter with his famous ontological argument for the existence of God which Aquinas would not accept, and his realism in the dispute over the universals which Aquinas felt impelled to modify. Another of the masters was Roscelin (1107), the teacher of nominalism, who proclaimed that abstract universal ideas, like horse or God even, were bare names and nothing more. Abelard urged that they were concepts, but had no external significance. William of Champeaux (1121) maintained that they existed in themselves. The scholastics, under the guidance of Aquinas, determined the matter later by insisting that universal concepts were indeed ideas, but had a justification in that there were positive entities from which the mind disentangled these universal ideas. This is that "temperate realism" which is still defended in the schools of philosophy. But the great name was *Abelard* (1079-1142), a Breton, brilliant and popular, displacing his masters, whose infatuation for Heloïse, twenty years younger than himself, broke his career more surely than did the opposition of S. Bernard, whose piety was shocked at the attitude of Abelard to truths of faith. Abelard held that everything should be challenged and all truths thrown into dispute; to defend this he was driven to maintain that a thing could be true in theology and

*Read Wulf's *Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages*.

false in philosophy, could be proved untrue and yet have to be believed.

S. Bernard (1153), vehement, a poet, with a pen that could be steeped in violence or beauty, who could denounce or move or inspire, felt rather than saw the weakness of this position which was re-affirmed by Bernard Sylvester, another Breton, and by William of Conches, the Norman whose city is now famous for its so admirably coloured glass.

It was to Cluny that Abelard turned at the end, and in Peter the Venerable (1156), its last great abbot, he found the sympathy he needed and made his peace with the Church.

Peter Lombard (d. 1160) was the great leader that followed Abelard; his *Book of Sentences* was the text book of theology for two hundred years, till the *Summa of Aquinas* displaced it, a continuation of the method of Abelard, Sic et Non, the pros and cons deliberately set out.

Gilbert de la Porrée (d. 1154) was, in his day, equally famous, coming from Chartres, the centre of the beauty of the time. Its architecture, its glass, its superb, austere and virginal sculpture show us the profound accomplishments of this wonderful twelfth century, the mother of the fruitful Middle Ages, holding in her the secrets of the triumphs of the age that followed.*

Beyond art and the schools was *law*. There had always survived, both in the civil administration of Italy and in the organisation of papal discipline, some remnant of the law of old Rome, but it had become infected with Teutonic or Lombard custom; also there remained that revision of it which had been issued in successive forms under Justinian. To read any of the writings of the Fathers (especially where theories of government are being discussed or the reason of the Incarnation) is to come on fragments of that old law, either in tags or in principles, incorporating the declarations and definitions of the later writers, like Ulpian (A.D. 230). Isidore of Seville, for instance, is a mine of such quotations. But the chief names to be remembered in the twelfth century of those who restored the old Roman Law are

*The best treatise on this is Mâle's *Religious Art in France in the Thirteenth Century*.

Irnerius (1140), a civil jurist first in the service of Countess Matilda and then of Henry V, defending the election of an anti-pope in 1118 against the lawyers of the papal court, and Ivo of Chartres (1115), whose work was the chief authority on Canon Law, till the *Concordia discordantium Canonum* of Gratian displaced it (1142). Under the name of the *Decretum* this last named compilation of the Benedictine monk held the field for many centuries; indeed, it has really only been displaced in our own day by the *Codex* of Benedict XV. Not that it possessed authority as a compilation, but its authority came to it because its texts were valuable, ancient and authentic, and because its method of arrangement was found to suit the convenience of the student and the lecturer. All subsequent compilations and commentaries followed its method of classifying the principles and facts of law.*

The good effects of the new infusion of Roman law were everywhere apparent, though there were evil effects as well. Law dominated the thought of the time. We find discussions of social and political ideals and of economic developments proceeding on the grounds of law. In effect there was an immense awakening of the ideas of justice; the great kings, like S. Louis or Edward I or Alfonso the Wise, were full of the need of the great principles of law; the reformers and rebels had to find their backing in the Pandects; the disputes of sovereigns could only be convincing when couched in the forms of law. These, as later for instance the claims of the English kings on the French crown, seem at times merely to be hypocritical and fictitious; yet it is a great achievement when an age defends its acts, not in terms of force, but of legality; when a people can be persuaded to quarrel only because of a legal principle; when war or rebellion are thought to need juridical justification in the eyes of public opinion. It is good for social order when Christendom becomes interested in proving public policy to be morally right.

But besides Roman law, an equal influence, and a fruitful and liberating one was *the philosophy of Aristotle*. It was not

*The most satisfactory account of Canon Law will be found in *The Legacy of the Middle Ages*, pp. 321-362.

wholly new in Europe, for Boethius, for instance, had been steeped in it and his writings had always been popular in the schools. But up till the thirteenth century it was his logic (*The Organon*) that had chiefly been known directly; then through the Moors and Persians the rest of his treatises became known. The intensely critical character of his philosophy was at first suspect in that age of humanism; to a literary age science is always at first suspect, because it is antipathetic. The Papacy forbade all public lecturing on the texts of Aristotle, but did not forbid the exposition of his ideas. But at Paris these texts were being hawked about and disputed by students; not the Greek text indeed (for not very many had knowledge of that tongue), but Latin translations direct from the Greek. On this account the popes modified their ordinance and forbade lecturing on the text of Aristotle "until it should have been corrected." Even this ordinance broke down; and *S. Thomas Aquinas* began at the papal court to lecture on the very text of Aristotle without reserve.

The effect of this new import of rational philosophy on the Western mind was wonderful. It brought a scientific training to the medieval mind. We find it from now onwards, argumentative, classifying and investigating, turning to a direct study of nature, watching and noting historical parallels, speculating on movement, on the stars, on the laws of human custom, on psychology, on the principles of art. For instance, under the inspiration of Aristotle's politics, it was discovered that it was a common fact amongst all nations that they had certain general practical principles for life, the need of government, of the division of private property, for some to work in a state and some to direct in it. It was noted that all these were practical laws of nature amongst all nations. We have here the beginning of their principle of a "right of nations" deduced from the law of nature, yet positive, which spring from some fixed need of man, difficult sometimes to defend in theory, but, from experience, inevitable in fact.

Again, Aristotle gave the scholastics their principle that in philosophy only reason has validity and not authority, and that theology is a science different from it because based on revelation

accepted as truth and worked upon by reason; but that philosophy and theology cannot disagree. This finished the debate between S. Bernard and Abelard; and S. Thomas on his death-bed wrote a commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, in which the lyricism of S. Bernard and the critical intellectualism of Abelard meet and are fused in a study on the beauty of truth.

Lastly, the *De Anima* of Aristotle gave them the principles of a psychology based on observation; the psychology of the Middle Ages is henceforward a vivid and startling presentation of the facts of consciousness as far as they were then discerned.

To Scripture the apparatus of critical study began to be generally applied; in art the principles of craftsmanship are finding justification; on music and on medicine, treatises were written which show—what alone science ever does show—that the generation that composed them was determined to rationalise, understand and explain the world and man to man himself. Old forms still linger, of course, in almost equal proportion to the new ideas. We end this period noticing that it sounds both notes—the note of classicism and the note of romance.*

*W. P. Ker's book on *The Dark Ages* is a most valuable handbook of the earlier literature of Europe, written with wide sympathy by a Keltic scholar who loved the Scandinavian languages and whose classical affiliation is also evident.

CHAPTER V

THE NEW NATIONS

THE next centuries that followed were the centuries of new nations, begotten by popes and cradled by kings. The nations in most cases owed their original unity to the Church rather than the State. It was the Church that usually fixed their boundaries, united them, gave them a centre, made them one. England is perhaps the clearest case of this. Scotland, however, is almost as clear; for these nations were established as ecclesiastical unities before they were political unities. They had one primate before they had one king. But, secondly, they owed their effective unity rather to the kings than to any spirit of nationality. It was the strong kings who fought with feudalism (which implied local sovereignties and, therefore, smaller nuclei) and who eventually established effective control over the territories within the geographical limits set by the Church. Thus the spirit of nationality usually followed the breakdown of feudalism rather than caused it.

The later Norman kings in England broke down the Norman feudatories and the old Anglo-Saxon earldoms, and by establishing a central justice and administration created English nationality, unity and the desire for it. This feeling of national unity was now, however, to be built up and completed all over Christendom by a new race of kings, and a new spirit in literature and a new series of wars and a new grouping of commerce and trade. It helps us to-day to picture to ourselves that earlier lack of national feeling, to remember that when Chartres cathedral was built it was part of English territory; more truly it was part of the territory of the English king. It would not be true to say that any part of France was ever really English territory, because it was never

English in temper or thought. But it is as well to remember that, though in the tenth and eleventh centuries this did not matter, by the middle of the thirteenth century it was beginning to matter very much. That the people belonged to the land that bore them was feudalism; that the land belonged to the people that lived on it was the new idea that was fast coming in. With this new idea came the further idea of nationality. A new world was struggling to its birth.

Of this new world of nationalities it is difficult to write an orderly history, for Europe had now lost any central figure or even figure-head it had ever had. The age of Charlemagne was an age of no one else but Charlemagne. He was the Europe of his age. Again, even after he had gone, the Ottos later *looked as* though they ruled Christendom, even if in effect their prominence was illusory; at least it was spectacular, even though not real. But Barbarossa and his immediate predecessors and successors no longer even appeared prominent as emperors in any unique way in Christendom; and with the death of Frederick II in the middle of the thirteenth century, not only the fact, but the hope of the return, of a universal monarchy was gone. We shall have later to mention Dante and the imperial pamphleteers who still talked of the empire (even in the frescoes of the Spanish chapel of S. Maria Novella the emperor figures as a secular pope and the pope as a spiritual emperor, sitting crowned on their thrones, side by side, between them ruling and judging the whole world), as though it were possible of resuscitation; it could only have looked like that (if it ever did) because the Papacy, its spiritual counterpart, still held its place as the doctrinal master of Christendom. Only the vitality of the Papacy gave any hope to the adherents of the empire that a supreme ruler of temporal Christendom could ever again be found.

England and Ireland and Scotland and a good deal of the North had escaped even Charlemagne: France as well escaped the Ottos: Italy and Germany escaped the rest of the emperors; only one of these at a time was governed by them, though at intervals both might be cowed.

It is not possible, therefore, to write the history of Europe any

longer round the empire. Of all the possible powers round which Europe could grow up, only the Papacy survived as a central vital fact.

THE PAPACY

We left the Papacy in charge of Gregory X. Innocent IV had fought with Frederick II and in effect had prevented his successful dominance of Europe; but in spite of some fine qualities, Innocent IV had antagonised the spiritually minded bishops of his time by his preoccupation with money, even though it was to finance the common struggle against Frederick that he resorted to unhappy expedients for raising money. It was he who, more than most other pontiffs, gave public evidence of the policy of appointing Italian and foreign clerics wholesale to benefices which ordinarily they never visited, or at least where they never resided. He was billeting the papal court on the peoples of Europe, or more often it lived on the money he was thus able to extract out of Europe for it. The money from these benefices was lost to the country and went direct to Rome.

This roused Bishop Grosseteste, of Lincoln, to his famous protest against Master Innocent, the pope's legate or representative, in England; the same policy was antagonising others equally noble-minded all over Europe. Money was often freely given; but none liked to have it forcibly taken from them. These temporal demands of the Papacy's prerogative began a quarrel in the opening of this period which only ended with the Reformation, almost at its close.

By 1271 Gregory X had become pope. He ruled only till 1276. His chief work was the Council of Lyons in 1274:

(i) It attempted to heal the Greek schism; S. Thomas Aquinas wrote his book to prove that the Greek Fathers and Greek Councils all proclaimed the primacy of the Bishops of the See of Rome as the successor of S. Peter.

(ii) It regulated the process of papal elections.

(a) The cardinals were to be assembled within ten days of the death of the pope.

(b) They were to be enclosed rigorously in the conclave

and not to be allowed to come out till an election was effected.

At this time, by the help of Charles of Anjou (brother of S. Louis and King of Naples and Sicily), the Roman patrimony of the popes was again solemnly confirmed to them; Rudolph of Hapsburg (established King of the Romans in 1273) renounced all claim to the suzerainty of this territory, which thenceforward, with occasional lapses, remained pontifical till the achievement of the Italian unity in the nineteenth century. It included the whole of Romagna, the March of Ancona, the Campagna and the city of Rome: that is, it turned east to the Adriatic from Bologna, descending from above Ravenna to considerably below Fermo, then turned west to the Mediterranean by Forlì and Arezzo and Cortona to Terracina, where it turned north through Tivoli to Spoleto and then east again to the sea. But though acknowledging them as sovereigns, it was not under the direct government of the popes till very much later. At first, and for centuries, they were far less effective monarchs in it than the French kings or the English kings were in their kingdoms. It was only in the fifteenth century that the popes governed as well as reigned over the Papal States.

Moreover, the pontiffs who succeeded to Gregory X belonged to the great families of Rome, or during their pontificate made heir families into great and *rival families*, whence later was to come so much of the distress of medieval Rome:

Nicholas III (1277-1280) was an Orsini.

Honorius IV (1285-1287) was a Savelli (like Honorius III).

Nicholas IV (1288-1292) was a Colonna.

These rivalries were sowing seeds of future trouble, not only in the history of the city, but in the history of Christendom. An immediate result was that after the death of Nicholas no election took place, despite the regulations of the Council of Lyons, because the disputes between the Roman families, their jealousies and rivalries, prevented the cardinals from adopting any particular candidate, for fear of antagonising the barons of the opposite party and making the new pontificate impossible. It was a characteristic of medieval life that in the end the candidate at

length chosen was famous only for holiness; after all the delay, it was felt that a saint alone would be acceptable to all parties. But it was less characteristic of medieval life that the saint, when chosen (*Celestine V* to whom, it is usually supposed, Dante referred in his description of the coward who "made the great refusal"), could not manage his office, and eventually resigned after ruling for only five months. Fear, lest he should be used by his successor's opponents to discredit that successor or challenge his legality, was no doubt the reason for his prompt imprisonment by the new pontiff, *Boniface VIII* (1294-1303). The predecessors of Boniface in the defence of what they judged to be spiritual interests had quarrelled with emperors; these new popes were to have their quarrels with kings. Boniface found himself in conflict almost at once with Edward I and Philip le Bel; the occasion of the conflict was, of course, money; the cause was the new national sentiment. The dispute had now shifted from the twelfth century struggle over "criminous clerks" to *the taxation of the clergy*, the feudal quarrel (the exemption of the cleric from secular justice) was finished, the national quarrel, his exemption from secular taxes, had begun. The first demand was more defensible than the second, so that while Becket's death saved the clerk from secular courts and secular justice till the Reformation, the taxative power of the clergy was decided in the end to be an affair for the national clergy to settle and not a matter to be settled for them by the Pope. The action of the Pope in forbidding the clergy to pay taxes (though no doubt he saw in the enactments of the kings a challenge to the spiritual supremacy) was considered both by Edward and by Philip to be treasonable and revolutionary, though it had a long precedent; Edward, with his legislative sense of fitness, declared the clergy outlaws, for he argued that, since they refused to fulfil their responsibilities as citizens, they should lose their rights as citizens, on his principle, deduced from the old Roman law, that what touched all must be borne by all. Philip, who was a bad financier, but greedy of money, answered it by the simple expedient of forbidding the sending of any money to the Holy See. He cut off the supplies. Again, when the Pope, against Edward, claimed the disputed

throne of Scotland as a fief of the Papacy, Edward carried the matter to a parliament at Lincoln, which denied that the temporal affairs of the kingdom were to be judged in Rome. It should be remembered that all the Pope claimed was to judge, not to govern; it was even this right of judgement which the nations now refused. The papal power of judgement in political affairs (as Pius IX declared later) had been granted by the public consent of Christendom; it was now by that same public consent being refused. Philip, too, like Edward, met the papal demands by a protest from the States General, but he was not content, as Edward was, with the fine answer of a people; he sent his envoys, Nogaret and others, to enter Anagni and to insult the Pope. Their action was denounced by Dante, who agreed with the attitude of France but not with this infamy. This infamy has become a legend, since it was decked out by imaginative chroniclers with extravagant details; all that we know for sure of what happened is, that some savage ill-treatment was done to Pope Boniface—so savage an ill-treatment that a few weeks later he died.

The next pope, *Benedict XI* (1303-1304), after holding as impartial a review as he could of the circumstances that had led to the death of Boniface (Benedict had been, whilst still a Dominican friar, legate from Boniface to Edward and to Philip), finally denounced the perpetrators of the crime, and was found dead himself within four weeks of this. Poison was immediately judged to have been the cause of his death.

THE AVIGNON POPES

The succeeding pontiff, Bertrand de Gôt, Archbishop of Bordeaux (1305-1314), was a subject of Edward I; but he is said to have had a secret meeting with Philip le Bel in a wood immediately after his election (he took the name of *Clement V*), and there to have come to an agreement with the King for mutual support over some transaction which involved "a dark mystery." No one claimed to have known what the secret was, but when the Templars were suppressed (Philip had long desired this) men whispered that this was the "dark mystery." Clement's reign was remarkable:

- (i) For his fixing of the Papal residence at Avignon in 1309.
- (ii) For the General Council of Vienne in 1312.
- (iii) For the suppression of the Knights Templar in 1312.

Of these no doubt the first was the most important. It took the popes away from Rome; this left Rome to go to ruin in the fierce contests of the baronial families; it placed the Papacy within close touch of France and under French influence (though Avignon was a free city and on the side of the Rhone that was not then French politically); but in effect France gained little enough by this move, for though, like Bertrand himself, many of the succeeding popes during the seventy years that they ruled from Avignon were French, in nationality, sympathy and design, France was unable to use the Papacy as the instrument of her policy.

Meanwhile the long years of *John XXII* (1316-1334) followed upon the rule of Clement V, taken up partly with a war of pamphlets, battles, depositions and schisms against Lewis of Bavaria, and partly by his magnificent efforts at foreign missionary enterprise. The quarrel with Lewis (1314-1347) began over the old claim of the popes to decide disputed elections to the empire, for a disputed election had followed the death of Henry VII (1308-1313). But it was only after Lewis had captured his rival, Frederick of Hapsburg, that the claim of John XXII was publicly made; it was too late by then for the papal forces to be used against Lewis decisively. Moreover, to be effective, this claim needed to be supported by the public conscience of Christendom. This it never secured; and a claim insisted on over a long pontificate without winning acceptance was bound to discredit itself unless it could be proved to rest on doctrinal principles. This the papalist supporters tried to prove. An outburst of literature followed, without previous parallel in Europe, which dealt with the disputed claim from every possible doctrinal standpoint; but the bitterly opposed papalist and imperialist defenders could not prove to the Christian conscience of Europe that either the temporalities of Peter or the spiritualities of Cæsar were of divine right.

It must not be assumed that the Papacy lost influence by its failure to make good its claim in this controversy, namely to rest

its temporal supremacy on its divine prerogative: for though the Papacy lost by this its political hegemony of Europe, by that very fact it gained spiritual predominance over Christendom; for it is observable through the history of the Church (which is not the matter of this volume) that the effective power of the popes has from the beginning steadily increased. Not this controversy nor the Avignon "captivity," as it was called, nor the Schism nor the Conciliar Movement weakened that power, though all these undoubtedly diminished the temporal lordship of the pope (which temporal lordship was an unconscionable time dying), for within a century and a half of these blows the primacy of the popes was defined as an article of faith, accepted by all the West and even signed as binding on them, by most of the patriarchs of the East; within two hundred and fifty years that primacy was defined even more clearly by the Council of Trent; and within five hundred and fifty years of then the infallibility of the popes was declared to have been held as part of the deposit of faith since the beginning. To-day the power of the popes over Catholics is more effective than it was under John XXII.

The *doctrinal disputes* then under this pontiff, in which Michael of Cesena, William Ockham, and Marsiglio of Padua were three of the leading protagonists of the emperor, weakened only his temporal but in no way his spiritual dominion. Even his temporal power was not altogether denied, for Ockham, in some ways the most daring of the three, maintained that under certain conditions the pope "can and ought to interfere in temporal matters," for he had a "fulness of power" which enabled him to supply all other powers, spiritual and temporal, when these had failed in their duty. Moreover, and this was the crux of the whole position, Ockham and the imperialists gave to the pope the office of "supreme judge and head under Christ of all the faithful." The difference, then, between the pope and the emperor, even in the eyes of the opponents of the Papacy, was that each was supreme in his own order, but that while the pope in cases of extreme necessity had a temporal judgeship, the emperor in cases of extreme necessity had no such corresponding spiritual judgeship.

It can hardly be denied that mischief was bound to come when some of the popes claimed a temporal judgeship under conditions which were normal and did not warrant it.

Perhaps the quarrel was over the meaning of the word judgeship; it can be stated roundly that all medieval writers allow the pope to be the *judge* of kings (it was the very phrase reported of Constantine), but that some of the papal defenders and some of the popes themselves definitely claimed to be not merely judges but *rulers*. This idea of the pope as political ruler of Christendom was never generally accepted and has disappeared from the claims of the Papacy; but the idea of the pope as the supreme judge (not of feudalities but) of Christendom was seldom wholly denied. That still remains.

Almost at the moment when Pope John XXII was having his conflict with the Emperor, the Statute of Provisors was passed in England (1351) and the Statute of Præmunire (1353) (though afterwards considerably enlarged, Provisors in 1390, Præmunire in 1393), which shows that not Germany only was alarmed at the possibility of papal encroachments on the rights and independence of the new nations. But the great date in German history was 1338 when all the electors met at Rense (on the Rhine) and declared:

- (i) That the imperial authority proceeded directly from God.
- (ii) That the elected emperor did not need confirmation or even coronation from any one in order to be lawful emperor.

In August this was confirmed by another diet at Frankfort. But the emperors were unable even politically to uphold their universal pretensions or any definite claims in Italy, for (i) their policy as against the popes was not national, but imperial, and the nations were already born; (ii) it was based on a supposition of general good-will of Christian peoples towards the imperial idea, which no longer held; (iii) it included a claim to a spiritual supremacy, which outraged the medieval sense of fitness (as when Lewis of Bavaria granted Margaret Maultasch, heiress of the Tyrol, a divorce from her husband John Henry of Moravia, the son of the blind King of Bohemia, and gave her a dispensation to marry his son). The death of Lewis during a boar hunt in

1347 ended for the moment the pretentious claims of the imperialists.

ROME WITHOUT THE POPES

Meanwhile, Rome, though emptied of the popes, was nominally under the rule of the papal vicars, but in fact torn with the incessant struggles of the great baronial families. The unhappiness of the citizens during these lawless conflicts inspired the gallant attempt of *Cola di Rienzi* (whose statue by the steps of the Capitol marks the historic importance of his legend) to restore the greatness of the city by an appeal to the perpetual memories of the old traditions of Rome. To the ultimate advantage of an obscure parentage (which enabled him later to claim to be a natural son of the Emperor Henry VII), he added the immediate advantages of personal beauty and convincing eloquence; he had steeped himself, like Dante, in the grandiloquence of Livy; under this inspiration he made efforts to bring the pope back to Rome. Failing this, he persuaded the papal vicar to authorise his adventure and suddenly, calling himself by the venerable name of Tribune, promulgated "the laws of the good estate" on May 20th, 1347. Good order was to be maintained:

- (i) By abolition of private garrisons and fortified houses.
- (ii) By a public armed force of a hundred foot and twenty-five horse soldiers, to be raised in, and supported by, each of the thirteen districts of Rome.
- (iii) By the establishment of an armed ship in each port.
- (iv) By the organisation of river-police on the Tiber.

The immediate effect of this revolution was to bring the nobles into subjection. To enforce it, no more was needed than an attack upon the house of the Colonna, who had made sneering references to the Tribune. After this success at home, Rienzi suddenly found himself called on to take a more public step. He was asked to arbitrate in the quarrel between Lewis of Hungary and Joanna of Naples in their dispute over the government of the Kingdom of Naples: he now dreamed of a wider mission, and proceeded to order back to the city the pope and cardinals, no longer a suppliant as when he began his career but (so he thought)

a master; then to summon the disputants for the empire, Lewis of Bavaria and Charles of Bohemia, to his judgement; finally to be crowned with a mystic tiara of seven crowns after bathing in the porphyry font of Constantine. But he was not strong enough or bold enough to carry out even his reforms at Rome, and after first showing harshness to the nobles he weakened in his severity to them. The papal vicar, who had been glad enough of Rienzi's domination when he saw how the nobles were kept in order, but who now saw signs of the breakdown of this iron rule, began to show himself afraid of the consequences even to the Papacy of the extravagances of the Tribune's claims to the powers of the older republic. Startled by all this into a fear of his personal insecurity Rienzi abdicated 15th December, 1347, and fled from Rome.

Hot on the confusion which followed his abdication came the Black Death; when it was over, Rienzi was found at the court of the new Emperor Charles IV with a new scheme of government for Rome, prepared in his years of exile under the inspiration of some of the imperialist politicians. It contained amongst other provisions

(i) That the pope and clergy should be deprived of temporal rule .

(ii) That the local tyrants should be expelled from Italian cities.

(iii) That the emperor should live in, and rule from, Rome.

The court was then (August 1351) at Prague; Charles, who had no illusions over the empire and even less over the projects of Rienzi, sent him as a prisoner to the Pope at Avignon. Meanwhile, the new Pope, *Innocent VI* (1352-1362) had determined to take in hand the pacification of the papal territory and had sent Cardinal Albornozy to restore the power of the popes in them. The Cardinal saw that Rienzi's line of policy—namely, supporting the democracy of Rome against the noble families, was the correct one. Moreover, this was also the traditional policy of the Holy See. Consequently Rienzi was now liberated and sent forward again and received papal protection for that part of his scheme which included the expulsion of the tyrants and the maintenance of order and the older freedom of the republic. He

was named Senator by the Pope; but his rule in the new rôle was as imprudent and indiscreet as before, and he was murdered by the mob on 8th October, 1354. But he had blazed the trail for the popes; in all the cities of the Romagna and in Bologna insurrections were organised, supported and made successful; everywhere the tyrants were driven out and the cities given their liberation, but the papal authority confirmed in them. These were but the difficult beginnings of the recovery by the Papacy of its temporal rule in Italy; difficult, for not everywhere was it successful. In Milan Bernabo Visconti made the papal legates, who carried a bull of excommunication to him from the Pope, eat the bull, parchment and seal besides. Still, in 1368 Pope Urban V (1362-1370) returned to Rome and was joined by the Emperor. This seemed likely to be the beginning of a new era. But the new era was quickly over. Two years later the Pope left the disorderly and uncomfortable city where he was a foreigner and returned to Marseilles and thence to Avignon. This immediately undid the work of Albornoz, for the Romagna, no longer dominated by the Pope, everywhere reverted to its tyrants.

THE GREAT SCHISM

Then came *Gregory XI* (1371-1378), who under the persuasion of Charles IV (whose influence had before succeeded in bringing Urban V to Rome), and inspired by the spiritual courage of S. Catherine of Siena, left Avignon for the Eternal City. This was to prove the end of the "captivity," but indirectly it led to the great Schism. Within a few months of his arrival and already restless in the uncared for and barely furnished palaces, Gregory was preparing to leave Rome, when death surprisingly forestalled his plans. At the conclave that followed the Roman mob, determined not again to lose the Papacy and its so evident advantages, made a violent demonstration outside the walls of the palace, with threats of violence unless a Roman were elected, guessing that only a Roman would care to stay in Rome and love it enough to trouble to restore it. Under these threats the cardinals (the majority of them French) pretended that the only Roman cardinal there was had been elected and, as soon as the

mob received the news with acclamation, fled, leaving it later to be discovered that the real pope was Bartholomew Prignano, Archbishop of Bari—no Roman, but a Neapolitan, who took the title of *Urban VI* (1378-1389). Urban's stern resolve to reform the papal court and break down the luxury of its life and especially to retain it in Rome, was made less palatable to the French cardinals by his dominating unmannerliness and his bitter tongue.

In despair of otherwise escaping from the mournful city, the French cardinals withdrew to Anagni, secured the support of Naples, and elected as pope, Robert of Geneva, the military papal vicar who had succeeded Albornoz. He accepted office, and under the title of *Clement VII* (1378-1394) began the Great Schism. Under the threats of Wenzel, King of the Romans, son and successor of Charles IV, the Schismatic Pope fled from the territory of the Queen of Naples (her subjects, but not the Queen, were favourable to Urban their countryman) to Avignon; it was at Avignon, in the home of the "captivity" and in conditions of luxury, that the rival Papacy was set up.

Roman Pontiffs

Urban VI, 1378-1389
Boniface VI, 1389-1404
Innocent VII, 1404-1406
Gregory XII, 1406-1415

Avignon Pontiffs

Clement VII, 1378-1394
Benedict XIII, 1394-1415

Pisan Popes

Alexander V, 1409-1410
John XXIII, 1410-1415

Note that a prospect that the Schism might be healed seemed likely when the universities of Paris, Oxford and Prague (which last Charles IV had founded and which inherited his spirit) took the matter up and began negotiations to end it; this was at the close of the century. As a result, in 1407 Benedict XIII opened up communications with Gregory XII, who had already accepted the Papacy only on the condition that he should be ready to resign it in the interests of peace. The two, however, could not be brought to meet.

In despair, a new idea was mooted, that both should be deposed at a General Council, to consist of the cardinals of both sides; but the rival pontiffs refused to accept this solution and threatened to

create a new cardinal for every one who left them. In spite of this many cardinals, especially of the Avignon obedience, came to Pisa, where a council opened on 25th March, 1409. Besides the cardinals, the names of two others present at it are famous—Peter d'Ailly and John Gerson, the most celebrated ecclesiastics in France at the time. These were anxious to promote both the reunion of the Church under a single pontiff and the reform of the Church. Much time was spent at the council discussing which should come first, reunion or reform. In the end it was settled:

(a) That the unity of the Church should be dealt with first.

(b) But that the council should not separate till reform had also been effected.

The council began by hearing the charges made against the rival claimants to the Papacy and then passed on to judge them and depose them. Of course no council could depose a pope or even rival claimants to the Papacy on grounds of public necessity, for this would have implied a human origin to the Papacy. A council could, however, declare that a pope was *ipso facto* deposed on the ground that it had investigated the charges made against him and found them to be true.

A pope who had committed certain crimes would automatically cease to be pope; a council could make public declaration of the truth or falsehood of these charges. What would follow would not be the result of any power in the council to depose or confirm, but merely to declare publicly whether alleged facts have been proved to have been true. After thus removing the pope and his rival, however, the council proceeded to elect as pope the Archbishop of Milan, who took the title of Alexander V; it then (7th August, 1409) dissolved without doing anything to reform the Church, except that it appointed 1412 as the year in which a new council entirely devoted to reform should meet.

But it was his successor within ten months, Baldassare Cossa (under the title of John XXIII), who chiefly figured as the third claimant to the Papacy; for neither of the other two would accept the decision of Pisa or resign, so that the confusion was now even

worse than before the council, since there were now three claimants to the Papacy instead of two.

But—

(i) The known fact of Baldassare Cossa's life (as a free-booter) made his claims little sacred in the public opinion of Europe.

(ii) Benedict XIII (of Avignon) had little more support than his own Spanish kingdoms, and even these but haltingly.

(iii) Gregory XII (of Rome), though old and decrepit, had the clearest legal claim to the pontificate.

THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE

In face of this, Sigismund, who was King of the Romans and soon to be Emperor, and had the noble ambition that as head of the Holy Roman Empire he should end the Schism, convoked the Council of Constance, which opened in 1414. At this council John XXIII was present and seemed at first to have some political chance of success, but his character lost him the support of those very clerics whose idealism alone had made the council possible. When he saw that his hopes were illusory, he fled, disguised as a groom. Hardly had he gone than, on 29th May 1415, the council deposed him; it did not attempt to repeat the error of Pisa, but remained hesitant as to its next move until Sigismund undertook (a) to persuade the other pontiffs to come to terms and (b) to conciliate the princes of Europe. The council dealt with the charges against John Hus, who had attended the council under cover of a safe-conduct from the Emperor himself. John Hus had already been executed on 6th July, 1415, before Sigismund left. Sigismund wantonly withdrew his safe-conduct when he realised that the doctrine of Hus included the Wycliffe tenet of the invalidity of the authority and rights of any one in mortal sin. This was too personal for Sigismund to be passed over lightly. He ordered him to be burnt. Burnt he was, on 6th July, 1415. Jerome of Prague was similarly dealt with after Sigismund had gone.

When Sigismund returned it was found that some at least of his projects had been attained; he had persuaded the Spaniards to

abandon Benedict XIII, his troops under Frederick of Hohen-zollern had taken John XXIII a prisoner; moreover, Gregory now sent Cardinal John of Ragusa and Charles Malatesta (with his half-brother Robert the Franciscan, the only shining glories in a terrible family history) to offer his resignation to the Fathers. Even a chronicler hostile to him relates how gladly the Pope took off his tiara and other pontifical vestments and declared his intention of never wearing them again. At the fourteenth session, therefore, in Gregory's name the council was formally convoked and confirmed, and to it, now lawfully constituted, his resignation was made. Again, as at Pisa, there was some dispute as to whether reform or re-union should take precedence; and again re-union was considered of greater moment, so an election was immediately proceeded with, and on 11th November, 1417, the choice fell on Odo Colonna, who, since it was the feast day of that saint, took the name of Martin V (1417-1431). The next year, May 1418, he dissolved the council; three years later he entered Rome. The clamours of the Roman people after the death of Gregory XI were justified; a Roman was now pontiff, and the Roman returned to Rome.

THE COUNCIL OF BÂLE

Moreover, since at his election Martin had promised to call another council to reform the Church, he ordered one to meet ten years later, on March 4th at Bâle; but before it could meet he had died. *Eugenius IV* (1431-1447) succeeded him and continued the appointment of Cardinal Cesarini as legate to the council which was to meet at Bâle.

One important innovation was begun at Bâle, which has since endured at General Councils, the dividing up of the members into commissions to sift and prepare the matter for the council, and to introduce the matter thus prepared to plenary sessions of the whole council. We know of four such commissions at the opening of the Council of Bâle, for the restoration of peace, for questions of doctrine, for Church-reform, and for the general affairs of the council. But at Bâle only few clergy of any hierarchic importance were present, so that the rest were able to secure as a

principle that the voting should be by numbers; this produced an irresponsible spirit, since almost anyone could attend, and therefore vote. The council was suppressed by the Pope at the end of the year. It withstood, however, the papal suppression and continued to hold its meetings, establishing as almost its only success the famous *Compactata*, which ended for a time the long quarrel in Bohemia, which was partly political (with complications, even to-day fatally evident, between the mixed German and Bohemian or Czech races) and partly religious under the inspiration of Wycliffe's doctrine adapted and modified by Hus. The *Compactata* consisted of four chief heads:

(i) Communion under both kinds to be allowed in Bohemia and Moravia.

(ii) Liberty of preaching allowed to priests duly ordained and under the authority of the bishops.

(iii) Criminous clerks to be dealt with "according to the law of God and ordinances of the Fathers."

(iv) Clerics to be allowed to hold property and enjoy temporal rule.

Eugenius IV, now finding that the council was really effective, again approved of its labours and declared it œcumenical. It proceeded to vote against papal reservation, restricting appeals from diocesan bishops to the pope, recommending everywhere the holding of diocesan and provincial synods, and the abolition of the custom of paying the first year's revenue of a benefice to the pope. In all these proposals it was followed later by the Council of Trent. But when it proceeded to deny the papal right to cassate the elections of bishops, to forbid all papal commendations, and to declare appeals from a council to the pope to be heretical, it lost the support of public opinion and was deserted by the few prominent ecclesiastics still in attendance.

This desertion, to which we must return in the next chapter, showed that the lowest point to which the prestige of the Papacy sank in Christendom had been reached and that the return had begun. Public opinion revolted from this extreme democracy of clerical irresponsibility, for it was now seen to be an attack, not upon the temporal jurisdiction of the popes—which was always a

popular subject for discussion and a weak defence in moments of hostility—but upon his spiritual powers. At Bâle the English were revolted by this infringement of the spiritual prerogatives of the sovereign pontiff, and were the first of the nations to protest against this tendency to belittle what Europe then needed more sorely than ever, a spiritual rejuvenation; for they insisted that this depended for its whole success on the leadership of the pope.

THE DECLINE OF THE EMPIRE

The Empire meanwhile had steadily lost, not only power, but even prestige.

(i) Its princes were always exerting their strength against the emperor.

(ii) Its contest with the Papacy, even when it was successful, had weakened it.

(iii) Its claim on the crown of Italy had been a perpetual distraction.

(iv) Its elective character had given rise to civil wars over disputed elections, to the election by the princes of that candidate only who was least likely to disturb them, and therefore to the shifting of the title from any family which in consequence of once holding it had built up a territorial power.

Of these princes the four chief families at the beginning of the period were:

THE ASCANIAN, which held in its elder branch, Brandenburg.

[in its younger branch, Saxony.

WELF (GUELF), which held Brunswick.

WITTELSBACH, which held in one branch, Upper Bavaria and the Palatinate.

in another Lower Bavaria.

WETTIN, which then held Meissen and Thuringia, and was later to hold Saxony.

Finally there was the Slav dynasty (the Premyslides) of Otokar, King of Bohemia, who had added to his royal dominions the fiefs of Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola.

By the end of this period the Hohenzollern had got possession

of Brandenburg and the Hapsburg of the conglomerate territories of Otokar. We are then already near the political geography of modern Europe. Besides the lay princes there were the three bishoprics of Mainz, Cologne and Trier (or Treves) along the Rhine, which were principedoms in the empire as well as bishoprics. Also there were the free cities of the empire, dependent for their greatness on the trade routes by land or sea, occasionally in league, more often isolated, petted or fretted by the emperors and the princes. Also there were a host of smaller sovereigns, knights and gentry whose feudal independence was the cause of immense pride and absurd pretensions, and who increased the difficulties in the way of general unity of Germany.

With the fall of the house of Hohenstaufen, the interregnum, in which Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso X of Castile disputed the succession, made the relaxation of public order even more conspicuous. The interregnum was ended by the accession of Rudolph of Hapsburg (1273-1291), whose family holdings in Swabia were so petty that none of the electors were afraid of the effects of raising him to the imperial power. He at once began a new policy, by handing over Italy to the Pope and the House of Anjou, and then turned against Otokar, who alone of the princes had refused to accept his election. After varying fortunes, Otokar was defeated and slain (1278), and the provinces of Austria, Styria, Carniola and Corinthia were handed over to the children of Rudolph on the strength of the old principle that vacant fiefs reverted to the emperor; Otokar's son retained Bohemia, and married a daughter of Rudolph, while one of Rudolph's sons married the sister of the new young king. Rudolph, however, who had thus founded the fortunes of his family was for that very reason unable to secure the succession of the empire for his son. The electors were now afraid. At his death, the policy that had elected the Hapsburg in 1273 was continued in the election of Adolph of Nassau (5th May, 1292). Adolph (1292-1298) made efforts as considerable as Rudolph had done to establish his house too, but with less success; at the death of the Wettin prince he claimed Meissen and Thuringia as vacant imperial fiefs, but he failed to secure them, and his policy of friendliness with the

towns, to give him a makeweight against his insubordinate dukes, cost him his life in the battle of Göllheim (2nd July, 1298), when the feudatories rallied against him to defend their rights over these towns.

Albert of Austria, the son of Rudolph, had led the princes against Adolph, and now obtained his reward in being elected emperor (1298-1308). But his unpopularity ended in his assassination, an unpopularity due amongst the princes to his stern ruling of them, to his alliance with the towns, and his consequent (i) abolition of the tolls on the Rhine; (ii) recognition of the right of the towns to enlarge their boundaries and enrol as citizens men living in suburbs outside the city walls. It is implied by the chroniclers that his harsh appearance and his loss of an eye prejudiced against him the pageant-loving people of Germany. Moreover, he had to suffer the ignominy of watching Holland and Zeeland being added to the domain of Hainault without being able to do anything to prevent it, though he had hoped to secure them as vacant imperial fiefs (1299); of seeing Meissen and Thuringia slip back after all to a Wettin prince (1307); and be helpless to prevent Bohemia (which he gave after the murder of its young king to his son Rudolph) from throwing off the Hapsburg rule on Rudolph's sudden death (1307). Almost his only permanent achievement was the directing of the succession in Hungary from the Wittelsbach claimant to Charles Robert, his sister's son, the grandson of Charles II of Naples (1305). But this achievement really gave to France, already more than the match of any emperor, the further advantage of influence in Hungary through an Angevin prince, and thus placed the empire on the west, east and south within a French ringed fence.

Through these French influences, when Albert was murdered by the river Ruess on his way to an expedition against the Swiss (1308), the house of Luxembourg, again petty and poor, but allied to France by personal ties, succeeded to the empire in the person of *Henry VII* (28th October, 1308-1313). His achievements were inconsiderable, but thanks to the hopes and eloquence of Dante, he became a legend. His achievements can be thus simply enumerated:

- (i) He restored their tolls to the Rhenish princes (1310).
- (ii) He forbade the cities to extend burgher right to their suburbs (1310).
- (iii) He secured the crown of Bohemia for his son John and for his house.
- (iv) He invaded Italy:
 - (a) Endeavoured to arbitrate between Guelph and Ghibelline (1310).
 - (b) Secured the lordship of Genoa and Pisa (1311).
 - (c) Levied taxation on such cities as he could and appointed the Visconti his vicar in Milan after receiving there in 1311 the crown of Lombardy.
 - (d) Was crowned emperor in the basilica of S. John Lateran, since only force could have got him into S. Peter's (feast of S. Peter and Paul, 1312).
 - (e) Attacked Florence, but had to retreat.
 - (f) Marched against Robert of Naples, but died of fever outside Siena (24th August, 1313).

The young king's romantic character no doubt helped to establish the legend of his glories; but only Dante's hopes and his bitter unrest in exile could have led him to expect the recovery of old Rome's dominion over the world by an emperor who had deserted the only country which he might have been able to subdue, for a country which was so broken up into separate territories that, to possess himself of it, he would have had to conquer it kingdom by kingdom and city by city.

The concluding paragraph of Dante's *De Monarchia* gives some idea of his argument, though not of the heady eloquence in which the book is steeped—the eloquence of Livy:

“And now methinks I have reached the goal which I set before me. I have unravelled the truth of the questions which I asked; whether the office of monarchy was necessary to the welfare of the world; whether it was by right that the Roman people assumed to themselves the office of monarchy; and further that last question whether the authority of the monarch springs immediately from God or from some other. Yet the truth of this latter question must not be received so narrowly

as to deny in certain matters that the Roman prince is subject to the Roman pontiff. For that happiness which is subject to mortality in a sense is ordered with a view to the happiness which shall not taste of death. Let therefore Cæsar be reverent to Peter, as the first-born son should be reverent to his father, that he may be illuminated with the light of his father's grace, and so may be stronger to lighten the world over which he has been placed by Him alone who is the ruler of all things spiritual as well as temporal."

Not only had Henry abandoned Germany to its warring princes, but he had taken no care to provide for the succession, his son being too young to have any chance of election at his father's death. Indeed, when the news of it reached them, the princes were in no mood to have a weak ruler thrust on them; this time they were eager to secure the prize for themselves. A quarrel developed between the house of Wittelsbach (in the person of *Lewis of Upper Bavaria*) and the house of Hapsburg (in the person of Frederick, the son of Albert I). Both candidates were evenly matched, both secured electors, both were crowned; but after seven years fighting Lewis captured his rival in 1322 at Mühldorf, only to find himself summoned by the Pope to judgement, under the claim of the papal power to judge a disputed election. Lewis repudiated this claim, as in similar circumstances every possessor of the dignity naturally did. As by now national feeling was strong enough to be appealed to by kings, anxious to have behind them popular support in their contests with other temporal rulers, Lewis now appealed to the princes of the empire to second his repudiation in the hope that he might rally them round him and make himself the personal unifying centre of the empire, since his territorial position did not give him a chance to do so geographically. We have already told how, not long before his death, he succeeded in his appeal to national sentiment against the Pope at Rense in July 1338 and at Frankfort in August of the same year.

But though Lewis did at last rouse the princes to repel outside encroachment, he could not rouse them to any enthusiasm for his leadership. Within three years of Mühldorf he had released his

rival from his captivity (1325) and then invaded Italy (1327). At Milan he received the iron crown of Lombardy from a bishop who had been intruded into Arezzo, the archbishop preferring to leave the city than to crown him (1327). In Rome he was crowned emperor by two bishops—Albertini, who had been deposed from his see of Castello, and Orlandio, deposed from the see of Aleria in Corsica (January 1328). Moreover, faithful to imperial practice, he deposed John XXII and appointed a Franciscan to the Papacy; but his puppet was as mediocre as the bishops who had crowned him, and the Italians mocked this second-rate expedition and jeered Lewis back to his own country (1330), leaving behind him in Italy, dead of fever, his most illustrious councillor, Marsiglio of Padua, author of the *Defensor Pacis*, the keenest defender of the temporal supremacy of the empire, yet still medieval enough to maintain that all the emperor's powers lay in the gift of his subjects.

Once back at home, Lewis began to work for the aggrandisement of his house. Already, in 1323, on the usual plea of the fief being vacant, he secured Brandenburg for his son Lewis; on the death of his cousins he added Lower Bavaria; in 1341 he gave Margaret Maultasch, heiress of Corinthia and Tyrol, to the same son Lewis, after granting her a divorce from her husband, John Henry of Moravia, son of King John of Bohemia.

But this assumption of spiritual powers roused against him the very princes and people who had three years before at Rense and Frankfort agreed with him to repel the temporal interference of Rome. The Pope found little difficulty in naming a rival candidate; and in his selection went back to the house of Luxembourg, now royal in Bohemia. John, its king, had been blinded in a battle, and so he could not well be put up to the Germans as an effective candidate; he was set aside for his son, Charles, who in 1346 was elected King of the Romans by the three archbishops, by Rudolph of Saxony, and by his father as King of Bohemia. Immediately after the election, Charles and his father hurried to the support of the allied house of France at the battle of Crecy, where the King of Bohemia fell, and whence, according to Froissart's story, Charles, "when he perceived that it was likely to turn

against the French, departed and I do not well know what road he took." Luck, however, was on his side, and the death of Lewis (whose second wife had two years earlier brought Hainault, Holland and Zealand to swell the Wittelsbach dominions) was the beginning of his sudden possession of the undisputed leadership of Germany (1347-1378).

Remembering that John of Bohemia was his father and Henry VII his grandfather, we are astonished to see the marvellous grasp of the political situation of *Charles IV* and his tactical manœuvring to secure practical ends. He was a steady worker, with a legal sense, a capacity for diplomacy, and a love—a thoroughly medieval love—of orderliness.

A. He organised his own Bohemia, securing from the Pope—

(i) An archbishopric in Prague.

(ii) A university in Prague.

(iii) A Slavonic monastery in Prague, so that he might send missionaries eastwards.

(iv) The use of the Milanese rite in his church of S. Ambrose.

Also he developed the commerce of his country.

B. He entered Italy to be crowned in 1354, receiving both the crown of Lombardy in Milan and that of the empire in Rome (the Pope was absent, but commissioned the Cardinal of Ostia to perform the ceremony) and left immediately for the north again to escape all entanglements.

C. He held the great German diets of Nürnberg in 1355 and 1356, the results of which were seen in the Golden Bull of 1356.

(i) This fixed the number of the electors at seven, the three Archbishops of Mainz (Chancellor of Germany), Cologne (of Italy), and Treves (of Arles), the King of Bohemia (chief cup-bearer), the Count Palatine of the Rhine (grand seneschal), the Duke of Saxony (grand marshal), the Margrave of Brandenburg (grand chamberlain).

(ii) Decreed that the King of the Romans was to be elected (by simple majority) at Frankfort, crowned at Aachen, and to hold his first diet at Nürnberg.

(iii) Settled that territories were to be inherited according to the custom of primogeniture and never be divided.

(iv) Determined that, during a minority, the electoral vote and administration were to lie with the nearest male on the father's side.

(v) Gave the electoral princes (a) precedence of all others, and (b) the royal rights of coining money, and (c) of supreme and final appeal within their dominions.

(vi) Forbade the towns (a) to form any confederations (surrendered in 1378), (b) to extend their burgher-rights, (c) to harbour serfs without leave of their respective overlords.

This constructive side of the Golden Bull was intended to save the German duchies and the empire from disputed successions, to establish a definite and orderly constitution, and to interest the great princes in the task of defending their common unity. Moreover,

(a) By a marriage treaty with the house of Brabant he secured a reversion of its territories to the main line of Luxembourg (1356).

(b) At the death of Meinhard, the son of Margaret of Mautsch and grandson of the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria, Charles confirmed the Tyrol to the Hapsburgs and gained their support for his policy (1363).

(c) By a treaty with the Margraves of Brandenburg he secured a reversion of that electoral principedom to his house (1373).

(d) He betrothed his second son, Sigismund, to Maria, daughter of Lewis the Great, King of Hungary (whence Hungary descended to him in 1387).

(e) He secured the election of his son Wenzel as King of the Romans in his own lifetime (elected at Frankfort on June 16, crowned at Aachen on 6th July, 1373).

Two years later he died (29th November, 1378).

The empire had now been deliberately reduced, in its older sense of a universal dominion even with a German territory, to a dim legend; it gave little power of itself to its ruler, for the emperor had small territory in virtue of his office and depended wholly for his wealth upon his family domain. His vassals,

greater or less, were only nominally subject to him. He had no force of arms. He had no popular assembly.

Moreover, the empire, in its geographical meaning, lay in a ringed fence of enemies; with this advantage, however, that its menaced power gave it, perhaps, its only strong motive for cohesion: Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary (none of them Teutonic) hung on its eastern border; to the south-east was a weakened Byzantium and the menace of the Turk; to the more immediate south was growing up the confederation of Switzerland; to the south-west and west was not France only, but that survival of old Lotharingia which carried the name of Arles or Burgundy, and which intermittently became a determining factor in war and peace between the empire and France; while on the north, under the Union of Kalmar, and, even after its repeal, lay the Scandinavian kingdoms, Teutonic in blood, yet a race apart, opposed in policy and commerce to the imperial idea.

Unexpectedly, Charles's death for the moment brought *confusion to the empire*, for under his will his dominions fell apart in the continuation of the policy he had pursued even in his lifetime:

(i) Wenzel, crowned King of the Romans, (1378-1400) inherited Bohemia and Silesia.

(ii) Sigismund was given Brandenburg.

(iii) John of Gorlitz, third son, received Lausitz.

(iv) Jobst and Prokop, nephews, already jointly possessed Moravia.

(v) Another Wenzel, Charles's brother, still held Luxembourg and Brabant.

This personal division was cut across by other territorial divisions —

(a) The towns formed themselves into leagues, illegally of course, but driven to this in order to protect themselves.

(b) The knights and other free-booters resented any limitation to their trade of pillage, and quarrelled with the town leagues.

(c) The princes also renewed their opposition to them, for

these allied cities raised against them forces which they could not successfully destroy.

Again, the Hapsburgs lost the Swiss cantons, and the strength of the towns was seen when, at the peace of Eger (1389), the towns recovered the legal recognition of their leagues and were allowed to keep a proposed scheme of theirs for settling disputes between themselves and the princes.

(d) A disputed succession in Hungary and Poland (by the death of Lewis the Great [1380], whose two daughters were eventually recognised as his heiresses, each in one of the kingdoms) gave eventually to Sigismund, through his wife, Mary, the crown of Hungary (1387), and to Jagellon, the grand-prince of Lithuania (now made a Christian and baptised under the name of Ladislas), through the other daughter, Hedwig, the crown of Poland (1387).

By this time the incapacity of Wenzel (born in 1361) was evident, and trouble broke out in Bohemia, partly because of the age-long opposition between Slav and Teuton, partly because of the collapse of that good government which had reconciled Bohemia to Charles's foreign rule. This trouble was accentuated by the active opposition of Jobst in Moravia to Wenzel in Bohemia, and by the enforced preoccupation of Sigismund in his own affairs. Wenzel antagonised public opinion abroad by his recognition of the Visconti as Dukes of Milan (1395), and provoked the anger of Paris University by his inability to end the schism as he had promised, and scandalised the leaders of European politics by his public drunkenness when he met the mad Charles IV of France at Rheims in 1398.

Schism being then in the air, it was decided by four of the imperial electors to depose Wenzel and substitute Rupert of the Palatinate (1400). These rivals managed to make Bohemia and Italy for a time the centre of warfare; but this soon quieted down, and, within two years, they accepted their positions and ruled such territories as they could persuade to obey them. In 1410 Rupert died. A new effort had now to be made to disturb the rule of Wenzel, who unexpectedly offered to submit to a re-election, but Sigismund and Jobst at once set up as rivals for the

vacant throne. By an agreement between them Jobst got possession of Brandenburg and could vote for himself, but Sigismund repudiated his bargain with Jobst and decided to hand over Brandenburg and its vote to Frederick of Hohenzollern, lord of Nürnberg, who had saved his life in the battle of Nicopolis (1396) against the Turk. This was the beginning of that connection between Hohenzollern and Brandenburg which created a new European Power, and was to be the cause of many important future happenings. Jobst, seeing his chance gone, then decided that there was no imperial vacancy and that Wenzel was still king. Later he again repudiated this decision and secured an election of himself by five electors in October 1410; one month earlier Sigismund had also been elected by five electors, for the Brandenburg vote was thus given twice over. Meanwhile Wenzel at times continued to claim the royalty for himself.

THE EMPEROR SIGISMUND

But death solved this tangle of claimants and elections by removing Jobst suddenly in 1411, and Sigismund emerged from a second election as King of the Romans (1411-1437). He was already King of Hungary; he was heir to his childless brother in Bohemia; Brandenburg was his, and Dalmatia, and he had secured the leadership of Servia. He seemed truly to have reached an imperial greatness when he convoked the Council of Constance on 1st November, 1414.

All the time, however, his difficulties were never far off. Bohemia was always a dangerous religious centre, and its national feeling easily set it ablaze. The university, for instance, was divided politically and religiously, since in it the Slavs preponderated over, but had less power than, the Germans; the Germans not only were the more powerful, but they were also orthodox. The Slavs therefore showed their dislike of German discipline by turning rebel and heretical. The particular heresy of their day was Wycliffe's, so in default of better they chose that, modifying its extreme negations and making it more consonant with their Catholic faith. Wycliffe was known to them through Wenzel's sister, that Anne of Bohemia whom Richard II of Eng-

land married, and whose character Shakespeare has so sweetly dowered. But it was not the Wycliffe heresy that England knew that flourished in Bohemia, but one tempered by Hus to accept a real presence in the Eucharist and a modified form of private property. It even ceased soon to be heretical when its national independence was recognised by Wenzel's gift to the Bohemians of the chief power in their university. Hus remained its teacher, and his fate at Constance not only, unfairly, turned him into a legendary heresiarch, but also gave later to the element of political revolt the halo of martyred romance.

Hus and his doctrines were brought to trial at Constance, where Sigismund first defended them and then condemned them. On July 6, 1415, Hus was burnt. This was considered in Bohemia to be an act of treachery on Sigismund's part, since it was only on the strength of the safe conduct of Sigismund that Hus had agreed to attend the council; consequently, when Sigismund succeeded to Bohemia on Wenzel's death in 1419 the people publicly showed their indignation and dislike of him. Sigismund retaliated by persuading Martin V to publish a crusade against them, and worsened his case by gathering a German army to carry it out. After twelve years of successive defeats at the hands of the Bohemians the *Compactata* were drawn up, showing by the moderation of the demands how little heresy there had been in the minds of the bulk of the people. The victories of Ziska and Prokop were solid military successes, but the *Compactata* could have been given from the first, and hardly differed from the four articles of Prague devised in 1420 by the moderate party. Their earlier acceptance would have saved many lives and more bitterness.

But an important effect of these crusades against the Hussites was the reaction they caused in the political and military organisation of the empire. First Sigismund sought to raise money by levying an imperial tax, which the towns refused to grant; then when he tried to obtain it from the electors they endeavoured to make a bargain with him and to demand in exchange the right to carry on the government of the empire as an upper house or committee in charge of its home and foreign politics. This

Sigismund refused to accept. Then after other failures in 1427 the diet of Frankfort proposed:

- (i) The imposition of a general poll-tax and income tax.
- (ii) This revenue to be collected by local delegates.
- (iii) And to be paid by them to a central committee.
- (iv) This central committee to consist of the cardinal legate (Beaufort of Winchester) and the commander-in-chief (the Hohenzollern of Brandenburg), aided by a council of nine (composed of a delegate nominated by each of the six electors and three representatives of the towns).
- (v) The central committee to have authority to raise troops or revenue by taxation.

These reforms were approved and accepted by Sigismund. Even if they were not fully carried out, the fact of their proposal and acceptance marked a new era in the organisation of the empire.

An ironical commentary on them is that in 1432 Sigismund went to Rome to be crowned; in 1436, after the *Compactata* had been signed, he was recognised in Bohemia as its king; in 1437 he died. Sigismund, with his amazing energy, his versatility of interest, and his lucky amalgam of possessions and claims, began in his person an empire that corresponded to the suppositions of the Golden Bull, and that collapsed only with the Hapsburgs.

FRANCE

Meanwhile, the France of Louis IX had carried forward its own national development along lines of which England gave the model through her accident of being an island. It was easier to settle the limits of nationality when they had already been marked out by the sea. Hence England, early in her history, achieved a sense of nationality, not merely isolated by defined limits and a community of ideas, but under a single ruler whose unique position was never in doubt. France had had from the beginning the difficulty of knowing where its frontiers should be fixed, what boundary should be set to France itself, where the country of France ended and her conquests began. France has always been in flux, while England has stood still unchanged.

Moreover, the origins of the French are complicated by an amalgam of Kelt, Teuton, and Roman; with few Keltic words in their language (less than thirty) and fewer Teutonic, the French seemed allied to the Romans in classic ideals and in language, but separated from them by a keener clarity and a fanatical logic.

We have already shown that, in contradistinction to the empire, the central government in France had steadily lessened the powers of the baronage and increased the personal holdings of the king; continuous (from 987 to 1316) in one single family, as the imperial dignity was not, the French royalty grew in possessions, its sole obstacle of any independent importance being the feudal hold which England had in France through the Duchy of Aquitaine. This, it will be remembered, S. Louis had agreed, was to remain with the English crown. This accepted possession and the other claims put forward by the Plantagenets, always were capable of becoming an element of disorder, and giving recalcitrant nobles their chance to intrigue, bully, and disobey.

Meanwhile, the son of S. Louis, Philip the Rash (1270-1285), inherited from his uncle and aunt, dead of the plague, the territories of Toulouse, Poitou, Auvergne, and part of Provence (1271), and from his son's wife, Jeanne, heiress of Navarre, Champagne and Brie, the great territories to the west of Paris and to the east of Languedoc, which she brought with her to the crown. Else he added little gain to the achievement of his predecessor. He bequeathed to his three sons three kingdoms—France to the eldest, Philip the Fair (or the Beautiful), Aragon to the second (a titular royalty in Aragon, but a real lordship in Valois and Alençon), and Navarre to the third. From the second came the future monarchs of France of the house of Valois, from the third Gaston de Foix and Henry IV, founder and ancestor of the royal house of Bourbon. Philip the Rash is the watershed of the French monarchy, whence all subsequent kings of France have derived their right to rule.

Philip le Bel (1285-1314) achieved little, but began everything in France. His was the careful administration, the obscure organisation, the miserly accumulation of petty powers that gave

France the centralisation it has never lost. Philip was the father of that spirit of republican France which has destroyed the old provinces. He was the huckster that set the fashion to Louis XI. Between them, without scruple and with deceit, they fashioned into reality the dreams of S. Louis. Philip's quarrel with Edward I was unfair and unsuccessful; his quarrel with the Papacy and his treatment of the Pope shamed even Dante, the imperialist; his suppression of the Templars has burnt his name for cruelty yet deeper into human memory; almost the only definite gain his reign could show was Lyons (a free city of the empire) added to the political domain of France in 1312.

To the France, however, which Philip Augustus and S. Louis had organised Philip added two new features:

A. *The Parliament of Paris* was divided into three courts:

- (i) *Chambre des requetes* for lesser cases of first instance.
- (ii) *Chambre des enquetes* received and set in order all appeals.
- (iii) *Grande Chambre*:
 - (a) Decided all important appeals.
 - (b) Decided all cases dealing with the peers and the royal officials.

B. *The States General*, i.e. a body which included:

- (i) All tenants-in-chief of the crown in person or by proxy.
- (ii) The representatives of cathedral chapters and monasteries.
- (iii) The representatives of all towns of importance.
 - (a) These sat in three separate bodies as the three estates.
 - (b) They did not include the peasantry.
 - (c) They did not discuss, but registered, the royal programme.
 - (d) This programme was given them to approve.

In Philip's lifetime the States General were summoned—

In 1302 to oppose Boniface VIII.

In 1308 to condemn the Templars.

In 1314 to support the king in war with Flanders.

At Philip's death, in 1314, the crown passed quickly to four sovereigns in succession till it reached Philip of Valois (Philip VI, 1328-1350), through the excuse of a Salic law, deliberately

invented to exclude Edward III, whose descent came from the elder son through a female. The dispute that followed this succession was known as the Hundred Years War.

HUNDRED YEARS WAR

It was occasioned by other things than a mere claim to the throne:

(1) Robert of Artois, who had helped Philip VI (of Valois) to ascend the throne, sought from the new king the restitution of his rights to Artois; Philip allowed absurd charges to be made against him and refused his claims. Robert in 1332 fled to England.

(2) The Scotch war between the partisans of Robert Bruce and Edward involved the French and English, for the French were called in to aid the independence of Scotland under Bruce, and the English to secure the succession of Balliol, who had pledged himself to feudal homage to Edward of England.

(3) A Flemish adventure of Philip (1336) resulted in the suppression of the English trade with Flanders, for Edward cut off from the continent his supplies of wool, induced Flemish artisans to settle and work in Norfolk, and intrigued with James van Artevelde of Ghent to secure a rising against the Count of Flanders.

But trade could never be an ostensible cause of war in the medieval world, for a moral cause alone could then be held to justify so grave an act; consequently Edward set forward, instead, his claim to the French throne, which gave an air of legality to the proceedings and afforded a public excuse for the enthusiastic intervention of England. That intervention showed itself first in the victory of Sluys in 1340, resulting in the destruction of the French fleet, an armed raid on French Flanders ending in Edward's repulse, a treaty of nine months with Philip, and the federation and freedom of the Flemish towns.

Secondly, in the war in Brittany (1342) where, in a disputed succession, the Keltic heir (John de Montfort) was supported by Edward as against the French heir (Charles of Blois).

Thirdly, in the Flemish expedition, which resulted in the revolt

of Ghent from Van Artevelde, and its subsequent refusal to accept the government of the Black Prince.

But 1346 saw the victory of Crécy, near Abbeville, the sack of Poitiers, the capture of Poitou, the capture of Charles of Blois and his imprisonment in England, the defeat and capture of David Bruce at Neville's Cross, and the beginning of the siege of Calais, which, though heroically defended by Jean de Vienne, fell the next year into Edward's hands.

The next movement of importance was the raid of the Black Prince, which culminated in the battle of Poitiers, 1356, and the capture of King John II of France (1350-1364). In the battle an ill-judged order of the King of France to his horsemen to dismount gave to his less numerous opponents, through the skilled marksmanship of their archers, the chance to herd the crowded ranks of the French into a narrow space and to destroy almost the entire host of France.

One of the results of the war was that immediately, of themselves, the States General of the Langue d'oïl decided to raise money to defend the realm. They imposed by an ordinance of December 28th, 1355, (i) a tax on salt, and (ii) a tax of eight deniers in the pound on all sales.

The first of these taxes was most unpopular and the second failed in its purpose of raising revenue, for, by discouraging sales, it discouraged trade as well.

These were both repealed the next year and an income-tax was substituted, so astonishingly arranged that the incidence of it increased as the income on which it was levied diminished. Moreover, the revenue from this proved further to be inadequate, so in May 1356 the earlier taxes were reimposed.

Just at this time, in these French internal disputes over taxation, and the constitutional powers of the States General to fix and limit that taxation, we hear first the name of *Etienne Marcel*, who came into prominence in 1356 as a popular leader in Paris, and whose energy secured the ordinance of March 3, 1357, which:

(i) Appointed a commission of thirty-six with full executive power over the whole of France.

(ii) Granted an aid (to be collected and spent by officers of the States General) for the maintenance of three thousand men-at-arms.

(iii) Forbade the baronage to indulge in private wars.

(iv) Authorised the people to summon themselves by bell to oppose by force the collectors of purveyance by the nobles.

The result was:

(i) The enforced acceptance of these demands by the Dauphin (1357).^{*} (Dauphiné had fallen to the French crown, when Humbert the last Dauphin of Vienne became a Dominican friar in 1349 and sold his remaining life-interest in the fief to Philip VI, and had become the title of the eldest son of the King of France.)

(ii) Civil war (1358) between the party of Marcel and the Dauphin, who now was strong enough to break away from his enforced acceptance of the new constitution.

(iii) The outbreak of the Jacquerie with its unimaginable brutalities of revenge wrought by an exasperated peasantry on a greedy and incompetent baronage.

(iv) Its suppression with equal brutality, the Dauphin's attack on Paris, its capture and the assassination of Marcel (July 31, 1358).

The treaty of Bretigni (May 8, 1360) completed the pacification of the kingdom of France by fixing the terms of an English peace; but the romantic return of King John to captivity after his liberation as one of the terms of the treaty, because his son, Louis, a hostage for his father, had broken his parole and escaped from England, was not so much perhaps a fine gesture of noble feeling on the part of a romantic king as a tribute to the superior charms of London, in the royal prisoner's eyes, to Paris and a troubled kingdom. He died soon after his return in 1364.

Charles V, who ruled from that year till 1380, was the most careful statesman of the house of Valois, a student of politics and of economics, founding his organisation of government on abstract principles of scientific accuracy, and succeeding on the

^{*}John II was in captivity in England.

whole in living up to them by his administration. His ideas of government may be thus briefly tabulated:

(1) The office of kingship was for the rule of *all* his subjects and to promote their advantage; hence he laid down the principles for dealing with the army, the police, lepers, the power of the crown, the organisation and establishment of the regency, the procedure of parliament, etc.

(2) The monarchy was to be tempered by law.

(3) The subjects were to be consulted on the expenditure of the money raised by taxation, unless these were levied for the public use, for then the king was the sole judge (following Philip de Meziers against Nicholas of Oresme) of how they should be spent.

(4) Especial care was to be taken to gather good councillors for the crown on the Aristotelian principle, duly quoted, that many ordinary good councillors are worth more than one extraordinarily good councillor.

(5) To debase the coinage which belonged to the nation (so Oresme taught) was an injustice to the nation. To preserve its purity he melted down the royal plate between 1369-1373.

(6) Extraordinary taxation was to fall on the great vassals, and its incidence should be used to enforce control over them.

Lest it should seem that these principles were not likely to have been formulated by the King himself, it should be remembered that under his inspiration both the *Politics* and *Ethics* of Aristotle were translated into French.

Despite the official peace, the war with the English dragged on in Brittany under the guise of a civil war; it ended after varying fortunes with the possession of the province by de Montfort, with a remainder at his death to the house of Blois. Except for this, the schemes of England against Charles V went badly. Even in Spain, where France began its policy of interfering in disputed elections, the English candidate, though placed on the throne by the Black Prince, deserted his benefactor. But bereft of English support, he was soon unseated by the French candidate and stabbed to death. Thus in Castile Henry of Trastamara supplanted Peter the Cruel in 1369.

But the domestic policy of Charles V was spoilt at the end by his efforts to raise money for all these adventures and it ended, not merely in taxation, crushing beyond endurance, but in the sale of exemptions from taxation which brought in immediate funds, but diminished future revenue and proved later, after three hundred years of increasing misery, one of the causes of the Revolution.

When he was dying, Charles remitted the old tax on sales; but after his death it was re-imposed and led to the revolt of the mob under the name of the *Maillotins* (or Hammers) in 1382. Their demonstration secured its second repeal.

The accession of *Charles VI* (1380-1422) to power was shown (i) by a lively interference in Flanders in support of its count against the revolting cities, which ended in the defeat of the Flemish cities in the battle of Roosebek, which destroyed the political power of Ghent (1382), Philip Van Artevelde, the son of Jacob, being slain; (ii) by his instalment of royal officials as his advisers in the place of the royal uncles who had first guided his reluctant steps in power. The success of these officials provoked the attempted murder of the most famous of them, Oliver de Clisson, the constable, in 1392; the murderers fled to the Duke of Brittany for protection, and, as he refused to surrender them to the King, Charles marched furiously against him. But his health, undermined by evil living, broke down and for the remaining thirty years of his reign he remained insane. It was to amuse him that playing-cards are said to have been invented.

The insanity of the King led to a continuous outbreak of civil wars, headed on one side by one of the royal uncles, Philip, to whom John II had given Burgundy just before he left France for his second imprisonment in England, and who by his marriage with the heiress of Flanders added that country to his own (to which subsequently came through later Burgundian marriages with the Wittelsbachs of Bavaria, Holland, Hainault and Zealand, and eventually Brabant), and headed on the other by Louis, the King's brother. Both of these claimed the regency of the mad King. Louis had been given Orleans as a Duchy and had also secured Perigord, Valois, Dreux and Blois. His marriage in

1386 with Valentina Visconti brought him the fatal claim to the Milan Duchy, which dragged Louis XII, Charles IX and Francis I into their fruitless Italian expeditions.

Note at this time:

1. A wave of civil war over all Europe, chiefly a class war, in Germany the towns versus the princes; in Flanders, Ghent against its count; the insurrections connected with the names of John Ball and Wat Tyler in England; in France itself the rise of the Maillotins, the Jacquerie and Etienne Marcel. Now, Louis of Orleans had already taken the side of Richard II against his rebels, of Wenzel against Rupert, of the Avignon popes against council or concession. Hence the Burgundians in their opposition were driven to take the side of the cities and people and to stand out as champions of the popular cause.

2. The house of Burgundy held its territory massed on the east frontier of France, and therefore had to look eastwards for its expansion; moreover, its fiefs of Flanders and Franche-Comté were imperial fiefs. This imperial connection was always being used by the Burgundian dukes to impress the French monarchy with the menace of Burgundian independence, and tended to create in Burgundy a lack of interest in French troubles. The Orleans house, on the other hand, had its strength south and west of the Loire, and consequently was more devoted to the ideal of a united France.

3. The university of Paris favoured the Burgundians, hoping to find a noble and generous protector in the Duke, until one of its doctors, Jean Petit, under Burgundian influence, attempted to defend tyrannicide by quotations from Scripture, the Fathers, and Aristotle, and thus to justify the murder of Louis of Orleans (1407), which had taken place under the orders of the Duke. Scandalised at this, the university went over to the side of the Orleanists.

4. The geographical division between the two parties already noted was also almost a racial one, the south and west being more Romanised and more Keltic than the Frankish north and east. This diagonal line of geography and race has been a constant division in French history.

In 1407 Louis was assassinated, and ultimately John the Fearless, the Duke of Burgundy, proclaimed himself the instigator of the crime. This led to civil war, in which the leadership of the Orleanist cause passed to Bernard of Armagnac, father-in-law of the young Charles of Orleans and son-in-law of the Duke of Berri, the sole surviving uncle of the King. The civil war, moreover, led to the invasion of France by the English, on the invitation of both sides. Both sides were alternately helped by England, till the Armagnacs secured the capture of Paris in 1314 (and this fall of Paris, as so often it was to do in history, was the one event which made the kingdom reassert by reaction its essential unity). This led to the intervention of Henry V on the Burgundian side, the victory of Agincourt in 1415, the capture of Rouen in 1419, and the Treaty of Troyes in 1420, which made Henry V the regent and heir to Charles VI and gave him the princess Catherine of France as his wife. This English victory nearly healed the French quarrel by uniting the two parties; but a meeting of the rival factions on the bridge of Montereau sur Yonne on September 10, 1419, to arrange a truce to repel the invader, ended in the murder of John the Fearless by the Armagnacs in revenge for his assassination of Louis twelve years earlier.

The death of Henry V in August of 1422 and of Charles VI in October of the same year threw into the leadership of the quarrel an English boy king and an incompetent, but sane, King of France. It was soon evident that Henry's royalty in France depended entirely on the continuance of the opposition between the Burgundians and the Armagnacs; the murder therefore of John of Burgundy saved the English power for some years.

Then various follies detached Burgundy from England—

(i) Humphrey Duke of Gloucester married, by dispensation from the Anti-Pope Benedict XIII, Jacqueline, the heiress of Holland, Hainault, and Zealand whom Philip of Burgundy (son of Duke John) had already married to his cousin John IV of Brabant, so as ultimately to add these territories to the possession of the house of Burgundy. When Humphrey tired of her,

and pretended that he had scruples over the validity of the marriage, and took up with someone else, Philip was relieved of anxiety over the feared loss of the territory, but could not forget the insult.

(ii) At the siege of Orleans in 1428, the city had agreed to surrender to Philip of Burgundy if the English would withdraw. Bedford refused to allow this and Philip himself withdrew in indignation at this jealousy.

(iii) In 1432, the Duke of Bedford's wife (Philip's sister) died; and Bedford promptly married Jacquenetta, heiress of Luxembourg, one of Philip's vassals, without asking Philip's leave.

Moreover the Burgundian Duke was being drawn closer to the King. (i) Tannequi du Chatel (1427) and Tremouille (1434), both abettors of the murder of Duke John, were dismissed from the French court; (ii) Yolande of Aragon, the Queen, and Richemont of Brittany Constable of France, both of the old feudal party, were now in the ascendancy (1434); (iii) Agnes de Sorel, the King's mistress, threw her weight into the same patriotic cause. (iv) Already a third woman had appeared whose influence, greater even than Yolande's or Agnes's, turned the balance to the royal side, the Maid of Orleans, *Joan of Arc*. The following dates are capital for the rest of the campaign.

1429, April 29, the raising of the siege of Orleans. July 16th, Rheims was entered and the next day Charles VII was crowned.

1430, May 24, Joan was captured by John of Luxembourg (of the house of S. Pol) in an attempt to raise the siege of Compiègne; previously to this attack she had been inactive for several months, since Charles had refused to allow her to attack Paris and had disbanded his army. The Burgundians finally obtained her from John of Luxembourg.

1431, May 28, she was condemned and burnt at Rouen.

1435, Sept. 21, the treaty of Arras was signed whereby Burgundy and France were reconciled; on September 14, a week earlier, Bedford died.

1436, The fall of Paris (in English hands for sixteen years) to the

Burgundian army, and the beginning of the disappearance of the English from France after a long and straggling fight.

France was for the moment too exhausted to do more than carefully husband her resources; for this the character of Charles VII was admirable, its very defects and lack of enterprise helped to prepare the country for its recovery.

This period however brings us to consider nations that, though not new in Europe, were new in their national organisation and in their influence.

SCANDINAVIA AND THE HANSEATIC LEAGUE

Scandinavia now first began to emerge as a strong group of nations, strong at least in appearance; and its importance was due to its interference in the affairs of the southern states through its attack on the German Baltic cities, which went under the name of the Hanseatic League. This League was divided into four main sections, the

- (1) Westphalian with Cologne or Hamburg as the centre.
- (2) Saxon, comprising Bremen and the inland north German towns.
- (3) Wendish, under Lubeck, with Rostock, Wismar, etc.
- (4) Prussian under Danzig.

Owing to the growing specialisation of trade, these groups had not always common interests, and were on occasion divided. The name of Hansa was taken when they united because, at that date, its most common signification was a guild or association. Later the name was given to the Guildhall. The reasons for forming themselves into associations were—

(i) To help each other to protect their merchandise from the perils of the trade routes.

(ii) To form an organisation strong enough to protect goods stored in foreign markets.

(iii) To settle their own disputes amongst themselves in foreign places because, even there, their own laws bound them.

Thus for instance all the German towns united to form a single *hansa* in London in 1282. To the English these merchants were Easterlings or Osterlings (whence derives the name *sterling*).

Thus again finding that Denmark threatened the entrance of the Baltic and their fishing trade, Lubeck to the East of Jutland and Hamburg to the West formed an alliance in order to be able to arrange to carry their goods overland, if need be, from port to port, and so escape Danish aggression. Again in 1284, on hearing complaints of the ill-treatment of their merchants in Norway, the Hanse towns agreed to boycott Norway; this was seconded by a resolution that, should Bremen refuse to join the boycott it should be black-listed too. But it must not be thought that the policy of these towns was to form a national coalition; they were interested in little else than commerce, and they were willing to (and did) acknowledge any political authority which did not interfere with their trade.

Denmark, however, under King Eric Manved (1286-1320), tried to subdue these towns to its will, but after some success had to give up the attempt on the death of the King in 1320. Then followed years of war, with alternation of crushing defeats and victories, between the cities and Sweden and Norway; sometimes one or the other of these kingdoms was on the side of the towns, and sometimes fought against them, Norway and Sweden being sometimes under one king and sometimes separate. One incident of the war however had particular and powerful effect on the future of the North. Waldemar, King of Denmark (1340-1375), in 1363 persuaded Hakon, who was King of Norway (1343-1380) and son of Magnus, King of Sweden (1319-1363), to marry his daughter Margaret; thus the three kingdoms were brought into alliance, and the Hanseatic towns began to be afraid of their now more numerous opponents. But because they were essentially traders and did not object to acknowledging any sovereign who would give them peace, and because some of the cities were ready to submit to this triple alliance if they were left alone and others were not, fearing they would be taxed too heavily, divisions appeared amongst them. Eventually, by the Treaty of Stralsund, 24th May, 1370, signed by the royal allies and the barons, the victory of the Hanseatic League seemed complete:

(a) The League for fifteen years was to hold the castles of Skaania and two-thirds of its revenue.

- (b) It was thus to control the fisheries of the Sound.
- (c) No king was to be placed on the Danish throne.
 - (i) Unless he confirmed the privileges of the Hanse.
 - (ii) Without the consent of the towns.

Seven years later at Cologne the League formed itself definitely into a military and political alliance.

(i) A federal tax was levied to support the armed force in occupation of Skaania.

(ii) Federal assemblies were called more frequently to deal with important matters that now came to be settled.

(iii) Individual towns now fell under the attention and discipline of the League.

Already the League, in virtue of the treaty of Stralsund, had settled the succession at the death of Waldemar (1340-1375) by choosing Olaf (1376-1387), the son of Margaret and Hakon, instead of Albert, the son of Henry of Mecklenbourg and Ingleborg (sister of Margaret and with her joint heiress of the Danish throne). Olaf died in 1387, aged seventeen, and his mother, who had been meanwhile Regent of Norway and Denmark, was now made Queen of both these kingdoms. Through the support of the League, Margaret was now also offered the throne of Sweden, so that all three kingdoms were at last united (Albert of Mecklenburg, the intruded King of Sweden, abdicated after his defeat in 1389). But Margaret was childless; so she adopted the grandson of her sister, Eric of Pomerania, as her heir and persuaded the three kingdoms at *Kalmar* in 1397 to accept him as the heir of all three crowns, and his descendants alone as lawful kings. This act of the three kingdoms was confirmed after Margaret's death (1412) by the Swedish diet in 1435.

But Eric (1412-1438), who was too eager prosecuting his claims on Schleswig to attend to his proper royalties, had raised against him the League (which had become afraid of his securing too great a control of the Sound) and the people of his three kingdoms. He was deposed in 1439, and was succeeded in 1422 as King in the three countries, by Christopher of Bavaria, who died in 1448. After some delay, eventually in 1450, Denmark and Norway agreed to accept Christian of Oldenburg (1450-1481),

a descendant of the father of Eric Manved, as King of both nations. Henceforward, till the fall of the Napoleonic regime these two countries had the same monarch. Sweden for some time followed Christian, but at last it revolted and under Karl Knudson (1448-1471) head of the nobles and the leader of the revolt against Eric, it secured its independence, which was finally achieved as we shall see by Gustavus Vasa.

Meanwhile the Orkneys and Shetlands, which had been Danish since the tenth century, were offered as security for the dowry of Princess Margaret, daughter of Christian I, when she was married to James III of Scotland. As the dowry was never paid, these islands henceforward were reckoned as Scottish.

The Hanseatic League had suffered through these wars:

(i) Because during the wars the English and Dutch fishermen found their way into the Baltic and were never dislodged.

(ii) Because Christian would not allow them to trade in Copenhagen, but forced them to convert their Hanse into a Danish company.

(iii) The value of their trade declined when the herrings left the Baltic for the Flemish coast about 1450; though the herrings were in some measure replaced by the arrival of the cod.

(iv) These North German towns became infected with class jealousies that were everywhere causing civil war in Europe. Here the fight was between the trades and the wealthy families who tried to monopolise the sovereignty of trades. In some of the cities the trades gained, in others the families gained.

(v) They had no geographical contiguity nor class solidarity.

(vi) The Eastern side of their commerce was ruined when their monopoly at Novgorod was broken by Ivan the Great (1462-1505).

(vii) The encouragement given by traders and adventurers by the English crown enabled these to compete evenly with the League.

(viii) The Burgundian dukes had little difficulty in persuading their Flemish and Netherland towns to withdraw from a union which no longer benefited them. The Hohenzollerns used their influence to detach the Prussian group from any

union which limited their own power. The towns were not strong enough to withstand this absorbing policy of the territorial princes who surrounded them.

(ix) Finally, the discovery of the new trade-routes east and west destroyed their river and inland-sea commercial supremacy. Wealth now lay on the oceans and with the countries whose sea-board faced the oceans, Portugal, Spain, France, Holland and England.

POLAND AND LITHUANIA

Another Germanic group which was almost a new unity, were the territories ruled by the knights of the Teutonic Order, who had given up a crusade against the Turks for a crusade against the Slav. It had pushed out eastwards and founded some thirty towns east of the Vistula, and not only made these centres of German influence, but had Germanised old Slavonic towns like Danzig. Its trade at times surpassed that of the League even in the Baltic. In England it had specialized in grain and amber. Under it politically were:

- (i) A native nobility converted to Christianity.
- (ii) German knights, not of the Order, but enfeoffed for services.
- (iii) German town settlements.
- (iv) Contractors (with profits of jurisdiction) who had brought in the German colonists.
- (v) A Prussian native population (virtually serfs).

But in 1396 Poland and Lithuania were united under Jagellon (Ladislas V 1386-1433), and the old alliance between Poland and the Order against the outer heathen naturally ceased to function when Jagellon and his people had turned to Christ. Moreover Poland saw her need for a sea-board and pushed her rule down her river, the Vistula (on the banks of which were both her chief cities Cracow and Warsaw), to Danzig, which was then, and has always been, her hope for widening her commercial trade and wealth.

Thus the Order now lost its religious purpose; and losing this

the Order lost its character. It had lost even the loyalty of its civil population, who refused it either military service or war taxes. It was defeated by the Poles at Tannenberg in 1410. Efforts were made then to induce it to move down to the Lower Danube and to become again a crusading Order; but it refused these efforts and fell eventually under Polish rule. As a result, West Prussia became an integral part of Poland, the Prussian Hanse towns (except Königsberg) became Polish, and the Vistula a Polish river; East Prussia under the Grand Master became a Polish fief, and the Grand Master a Polish prince with a seat on the Polish Council; and the whole province became Slav and no longer German: it was only held to German traditions by the fact that the successive Grand Masters were chosen from the great German houses, Saxon, Franconian, and finally Hohenzollern. The last, a Hohenzollern, a century later, turning Protestant and marrying, became the chance cause of that union between the Electorate of Brandenburg (Hohenzollern) and Prussia, whence came at last the military monarchy of North-eastern Europe. Russia, Poland, Sweden all seized on parts of the knights' territory in Livonia and Esthonia, till all that survived of the fiefs of this crusading Order, the Knights of the Sword, was the Duchy of Courland.

The rulers of Pomerania and Mecklenburg were Slavonic and friendly to Poland; in Brandenburg the nobles were inclined to unite with Poland in a Slav kingdom because the privileges of the Polish nobles (received as the price of acknowledging Jagellon) were considerably above their own, and they nearly succeeded in preventing that continued Germanisation of the north-east which later made possible Frederick the Great and the German Empire of 1870.

But the Baltic was now divided between the Scandinavian and the Slav; for the moment the German was eliminated from the north shores of the Empire.

THE SWISS CONFEDERATION

The formation of the Swiss Confederation was another sign of the breaking of the unity of the empire and of the rise of nation-

ality, even though here there were none of those racial unities which seem essential for a nation's birth. We have already noticed the rise of the Hapsburgs to prominence under Rudolph I, who was elected king of the Romans in 1273 to end the long interregnum that followed the death of the heirs of Frederick II. At the moment of his election he was conducting a war on neighbouring forest cantons on the Aar, who had claimed exemption from his rule under an imperial charter of Frederick II; he paused in his struggle with them to turn to larger ventures. But at his death, the family no longer tempted by imperial distractions, returned to prosecute its local ambitions; in alarm the three cantons of Uri, Schwyz and Unterwalden at the head of the lake of Lucern, formed an Everlasting Compact in 1291, which united them in defence against oppression. It was promptly confirmed by the Emperor, Adolph of Nassau, who was glad to hamper Albert of Austria, Rudolph's ambitious son. When, on Adolph's murder, Albert became Emperor, the cantons do not seem to have troubled to do more; they only feared a Hapsburg who was free to attend to local ambitions. Consequently it was Leopold, brother of the Hapsburg rival of Louis of Bavaria, who next moved against them. He was defeated at Morgarten in 1315. Here the mountaineers showed themselves masters at their own method of war, and began their legend of invincible superiority. The Hapsburgs in 1318 agreed to acknowledge their administrative independence.

Lucern (1330), Zurich (1351), Bern (1353), and other less well known cantons threw in their lot with the rising confederation, for all kinds of reasons, to escape taxes as at Lucern, to bolster up personal tyranny as in Zurich, to avoid military service as did Glarus, even under compulsion as did Zug. But with each fresh accession a new step forward was made towards a closer political organisation. With each entry the treaty of union became clearer and more defined. A final victory over the Hapsburgs at Sempach in 1386 settled the independence of the cantons. By the treaty of 1389 all feudal claims over the confederate cities were renounced by the Hapsburgs for ever.

ITALY

Even Italy, in theory the home and titular kingdom of the empire, was no longer subject to the imperial rule. It had become broken into political fragments:

- (i) By its geographical conditions and its great length.
- (ii) By the lack of effective government by any distant king.
- (iii) By the central influence of the Papacy.
- (iv) By the inability of the cities to hold together in leagues.
- (v) By the long quarrel between Guelph and Ghibelline, i.e. the papal and imperial followers.

In 1266, Manfred, the illegitimate son of Frederick II, who had been crowned King of Sicily, was slain at Benevento.

His lawful son, Conrad, who had been elected King of the Romans in 1237, died in 1254; and his son, Conradin, was proclaimed King of Sicily in 1254, at the age of two, captured at Tagliacozzo (1268) at the age of fourteen and beheaded. Thus the last male heirs of the Hohenstaufen perished on Italian soil. But Charles of Anjou, the supplanter of the heirs of Frederick, had enjoyment of the kingdom of Sicily only till 1282 when the "Sicilian Vespers," or massacre of the French, took place on Easter Monday, occasioned by the insulting behaviour of an Angevin soldier to a woman. The catastrophe was never revenged, for Charles despaired of its recovery when the Sicilians offered the crown to Peter III of Aragon, husband of Manfred's daughter Constance; from his time onwards, the two crowns of Aragon and Sicily remained united. In 1435, even the kingdom of Naples fell to the house of Aragon. Up till then, however, Naples remained in the hands of the house of Anjou which ruled it with extraordinary skill. These Neapolitan Angevins were the champions of Christendom in the East, inheriting the title of King of Jerusalem from Mary, daughter of the Prince of Antioch, sending embassies to Tartary, Cairo, and Cathay, and welcoming Eastern imports in exchange for its exports of corn and cattle. In the North of Italy, the Kings of Naples held fiefs in Piedmont, were at times accepted as tyrants in Tuscany, and even received the lordship of Genoa. The princes of the House were themselves great merchants, lending their ships of war for trading purposes,

and even investing money in buccaneering with successful pirates, halving with them their gains from the booty and the ransoms of their captives. In 1331 Robert had a stock of sugar at Brindisi which could find no purchaser there, so, at the expense of the treasury, the king ordered it to be taken by land or sea (which ever was speedier) to Barletta to be put on a better market. Under supervision of the kings, the currency was normally pure and stable, the weights and measures uniform in each province, communications easy and secure. Their experiments in government-stimulation of commerce were fully justified by the sudden increase of wealth of this central Italian kingdom and its world wide traffic and well-organised export trade. But unfortunately for it, the real creators of this wealth and traffic were not the natives of the kingdom but foreigners. It was to attract them that the Angevin trade laws were introduced. The Neapolitan was by nature too lethargic to persist in commerce; so when Florence or Venice, or Genoa tempted the foreign trader northwards from Sicily and induced him to leave, there was no energy left behind to substitute new merchants, the ports of the kingdom grew more silent, and revenue steadily declined. Then came the banking failures of the Florentine houses, with which the Neapolitan market was intimately connected; neither the kings of England nor of Sicily would pay their debts. With the failure of these banks—in 1341 the Corsini and Bonacorsi, in 1343 the Bardi and Perruzzi—we find financial ruin overwhelming Naples and no recovery was attempted. The trading wealth of Naples was ended.

Above Naples were the papal states; above them Tuscany* with its cluster of independent cities, Siena, Pisa, Lucca, with *Florence* over them all. The constitution of Florence seems to have been stable enough when the withdrawal of the imperial vicars of Frederick II left the city to itself. But, as its wealth and power developed, its problem became acute and involved, viz: to establish an artisan democracy in a manufacturing city. This has often in history proved an impossible task. For this

*Read the *Story of Florence* by E. G. Gardner in the very useful Medieval Town Series.

democratic organisation had to control an agricultural, landed nobility, which was Teutonic in race and imperial in sympathy, in a city which boasted itself papal and a daughter of Rome. Moreover, the expansion of its trade and markets, and consequently of the need of defending them, brought out the difficulty of reconciling foreign conquest with domestic freedom, for a republic that rules an empire has usually only been successful when it has been a principedom in disguise.

These divisions seemed inevitable in Florence, where the racial, social, and spiritual elements were diverse. This was accentuated by an artificially prepared political system, consisting of a double executive, the colleges and the signory, which were deliberately intended to check each other and so prevent any social or economic oppression. As a result the machinery of government was unworkable, for there was no power or office that had real sovereignty in the State. In 1293, the Ordinances of Justice of Giano della Bella established the supremacy of the seven greater guilds (of cloth, wool, silk, medicine, law, banks, and fur) over the nobles through the supreme officer called the Gonfalonier, because an earlier constitution, introduced in 1282 which placed the city under the rule of six priors (called the signory), had proved impossible. Then in 1321 a board of twelve Buonuomini was introduced, without whom the signory could do nothing of importance; again in 1323, the *scrutiny* was introduced whereby the names of those qualified for office were placed in bags and drawn out at hazard to fill the vacancies as they occurred. These endless changes show how impracticable was the persisting original constitution of the city. They were attempts to patch up a system fundamentally unworkable. It could not prove a successful government, lacking any continuous policy and unable to escape from the initial policy of a careful balance of executive and legislative, which neutralised each other equally. Then in addition there was the Parte Guelfa, an outside political club, which swamped the offices by corrupt means, and through the freemasonry which it established was able gradually to turn the government of the city into a close corporation. A change of policy became noticeable in the fourteenth century, for at that

dáte the public action of Florence suddenly developed on lines that were continuous and stable; this was not difficult to account for. The government had been captured by a smaller group; first a family, the Albizzi, held power and then a single man, Cosimo de Medici, and his heirs.

At the extreme north-west of Italy was Genoa, with its trading wealth and its shipping soon to fall subject to France; a little nearer to the centre was Milan with its fine military position and its despots, the della Torre from 1259, and the Visconti from 1271; over to the extreme east lay Venice amid her lagoons. This last was a strange half-Byzantine city with its doge, a single ruler, almost autocratic, who gradually fell under the power of his council of six, all chosen from a list of families fixed finally in 1315 and never enlarged; this aristocratic system naturally divided the population of the state into the enfranchised and the disenfranchised. In 1310, to the council of six was added a council of ten, and these seventeen (elected by a complicated process) became the oligarchy who ruled the state.

Venice alone of the great Italian cities had no alien nobility to deal with, no strife between Guelph and Ghibelline, no factions such as in the others so frequently paralysed their efforts and broke their unity.

Gradually during the fourteenth century there emerged from this jumble of Italian states five who between them governed most of Italy, Venice and Milan in the north, then Florence, the papal states, and Naples. Of these Venice depended on the sea for her commerce eastwards, and on the open Alps for her western routes; Naples was frankly Guelphic and anti-imperial, holding its power by war and papal gift against the last heirs of the Hohenstaufen; Florence was the centre of the banking world and of the arts; Milan was ruled by tyrants who claimed to be imperial vicars; Rome was of the popes.

A brief interlude in the warfare between Guelph and Ghibelline, inflamed by the descent of Henry VII in 1310 and of Lewis of Bavaria in 1327, was occasioned by John of Bohemia, who came in 1330 on the invitation of Brescia, and who remained under promise to rule impartially without regard to faction or

party. But after a sudden success, the various powers all agreed that impartiality had its disadvantages. It meant that the ruler was no man's friend; united at least in their dislike of him, Florence, Naples, Milan, joined with the lesser cities to drive him out. Mastino della Scala of Verona, the wealthiest of the Tyrants then in Italy, gained most by the king's withdrawal; but this only occasioned further wars. Florence was involved in these, essayed the experiment of a foreign ruler by importing Walter de Brienne of the eastern Latin kingdom, with the pleasing title of Duke of Athens, got rid of him in ten months, and then followed this by repealing the Ordinances of Justice, suppressing the office of Gonfalonier, and re-introducing the nobles as a class of the State. But these too were soon changed again for the older constitution, tempered by the *ammonizio* whereby the *parte Guelpha* could now exclude anyone from office on the charge of being a Ghibelline. This ended the freedom of the city.

Meanwhile the cities were now too busy with commerce for their citizens to have the time or wish to fight their own battles; they began to hire mercenaries or condottieri whose only work was fighting, and whose only motive was pay. Werner, the first of these great captains, a German, in 1343 levied taxes wherever he went. On his corselet, he wrote grimly and meaningly: "Enemy to God, Pity, and Mercy." John Hawkwood, disguised in the letters of S. Catherine of Siena as Giovanni Acuto, was his English counterpart. There were many more.

The chief opportunity for these condottieri came from *Naples* where the Anjou line was in dispute between its descendants, Joanna and Andrew, who had married to save the dispute, and then quarrelled as to which of the two was ruler and which was consort; Andrew was murdered and Joanna married another claimant, who also died, and then was accused of the murder of her first husband and attacked by her brother-in-law, who also had some claims to the throne. On the eventual arrival of this brother-in-law, he proceeded to murder a fifth claimant, but had to return to his own kingdom of Hungary, leaving Joanna queen in fact, with the unhappy experience by then of having had three husbands and no direct heir. Haunted by ill-luck

after she had adopted as her successor a nephew of the claimant whom her rival had murdered, she found that this adopted successor took an opposite view to hers over the papal schism. In revenge she promptly offered to adopt in his place, Louis of Anjou, brother of Charles V of France. This adoption of hers was the basis of the long standing claim of the French kings to Naples; but Joanna herself never saw it enforced. She was captured by the successor whom she had nominated and then disinherited, and died while in captivity. After all her marriages, murders and changes of mind, it was he who succeeded her as Charles III. In 1386 his son Ladislas followed him on the throne, and in 1414 his daughter Joanna, in whom ended the direct line of the Anjou house in Naples.

Meanwhile *Florence* was given over to a family dispute between the Albizzi and the Ricci as to which was to secure predominance in the state; behind the Ricci loomed the Medici who built their power on popularity. For a brief moment the raising of the *Ciampi* or disenfranchised, under Michael Lando, threatened the city with mob-rule; but their moderation, statesmanship, and patriotism saved Florence from anything worse than a demonstration by the workers to enforce their better treatment by their employers. The oligarchy, however, that had its grip on Florence, steadily narrowed its numbers and steadily increased its power, and, moreover, intensified its foreign political ambitions, absorbing through war, finance or diplomacy most of the cities of northern Tuscany. This brought Florence into armed conflict with Milan, which had also grown by conquest under the Visconti to hold extensive foreign dominion. This family, holding the principedom from Henry VII under the title of imperial vicar in 1312, under its successive, vigorous and rather unscrupulous rulers, spread its dominion over central Lombardy, only blocked on the west by the houses of Montferrat and Savoy, on the east by the Gonzagas of Mantua, the Este of Ferrara, the della Scala of Verona, and the Carrara of Padua, on the south by the city of Bologna and to the north by the Alps. For a while even Genoa formed part of their territory.

The later Visconti were evil-living, tyrannous, and artistic,

marrying their daughters and sons into the great houses of Europe—for instance Lionel of Clarence, son of Edward III, married Violante, the daughter of Bernabo Visconti while Galeazzo's son Gian Galeazzo, married the daughter of the prisoner King of France.

This Gian Galeazzo was the most famous and infamous of his line, successful in extending his dominions, acknowledged as their master by the great houses which held sway to the west and east of him—Lord of Siena, Perugia and Assisi, of Lucca and Bologna, victor over the German troops of Rupert of the county Palatine; only death broke the spell of his conquests in 1402.

His dominions were broken up at his death: but his second son Filippo Maria by 1421 had recovered practically everything that his father had held. He had this danger to menace him that, in the wars that he undertook against Florence and Venice, his success was due entirely to Francesco Sforza, his condottiere general, who extorted from his master (i) his daughter, Bianca, in marriage, (ii) the lordship of Cremona, and was proceeding to attack his father-in-law when Filippo suddenly died. Under Sforza's able leadership, by order of the city, the wars were continued against Florence and Venice, Milan being proclaimed a republic; but in 1450 the Sforza turned on his own city, compelled its acceptance of him as its master, and without leave of emperor or any imperial confirmation made himself Duke of Milan in 1450. This is another sign that the Middle Ages were over: even legality of rule was no longer of importance: the very ideal of universal monarchy or of an imperial lord of Italy, the ideal of Charlemagne, Dante, and Ockham had gone for ever.

To the near west and to the further east of Milan, lay two rivals for the sea-trade of Italy, Genoa and Venice, rivals also for the trade of Christendom to the east. Genoa held the northern route of the trade, from the Black Sea to Constantinople, for the Genoese had not been accomplices in the overthrow of the eastern empire during the fourth Crusade, and were therefore established in the city by the Greeks when the Latins were driven out. The Genoese had also the western trade of the Mediterra-

nean or disputed it with Aragon; and they had settlements on the north African shore. But they had at home the most unstable of governments, in which Guelph and Ghibelline, or nobles hiding their ambitions under these names, quarrelled with too much fluctuation of success to secure for either a permanent form of rule.

Venice was more stable in government, better situated for the Eastern trade, and had a more easy access to flat land at the back of her lagoons: therefore though war might sometimes favour Genoa under its Doria admirals and sometimes Venice, especially when allied with Aragon (1353), the political stability of Venice gave her in the end the greater consistency of effort and plan. Indeed Venice won her final victory at Chioggia (June 24, 1380) when she was nearest to destruction, for the Genoese were blockading Venice and were slowly strangling her, when they were caught between two fleets and wholly destroyed. Thus it was on the very edge of her own islands that Venice defeated Genoa (June 24, 1380) and vindicated herself as no mere city of trade. Genoa never recovered from this destruction of her fleet. The prey of France and Milan and the victim of either after 1380, she ceased any more to trouble Venice.

Venice now established herself strongly both to the west on the mainland (1405) and to the east in Dalmatia (1421). But there were two parties and two policies in Venice then and for a long while to come, one (under Tommaso Mocenigo) urging that her Western expansion was to be defended but not increased, since this would merely lay her open to Milanese attack; the other (under Francesco Foscari) younger and less cautious as it seemed, preferred to go on perpetually attacking westwards as the surest method of defence. In 1425, the younger party secured the intervention of Venice on the side of Florence against Milan. Their chief general was Carmagnola whose success against Sforza and his fellow generals of Milan (Piccino and Carlo Malatesta, the representative of Gregory XII at Constance) drove the Milanese to make peace; when later he failed against Sforza, the Venetians recalled him through suspicion of his treachery, but on the pretext of consulting him,

tried him, condemned him and put him to death (1432). The chronicles of that period found in this act of Venice a matter of important comment. It was generally approved, for these hired generals (even Sforza) had a way of sending ultimatums to their employers at the moment of victory, for the home capital and the capital of the enemy were equally vulnerable to a general who had destroyed his foes.

The final triumph of Sforza in Milan drove Venice, now without a general, to the inglorious treaty of Lodi in 1454; the policy of Foscari, by this time doge of Venice, had failed, his son was put to death, himself condemned to resign (for Venice inherited the Eastern fashion of Carthage, which always put to death the unsuccessful leader), and the council of ten grew to greater tyranny. Hardly ever again was a doge able to secure a leading hand in directing the policy of the state.

THE TURKS

While these states were quarrelling, Constantinople had fallen in the hands of the Turks.

Asia Minor had been held by the Seljuk Turks for 250 years against Crusaders and Byzantines, but it was lost to the Mongols in 1307; upon this followed a long period of anarchy in which various Turkish princes ruled their several provinces. Of these Turkish princedoms only the territories of Ottman lay alongside the Christian border; he alone of the Emirs therefore could move without hurting men of his own faith. When the paralysing effect of the Mongol victories had worn off, he captured Brusa in 1326. His son Orkan who succeeded him was not only a soldier but a general, he organised the army, and created the janissaries (captured Christian children brought up in a monastic seclusion and discipline for ten years, and trained to war on the fiercest possible models, remaining the absolute property of the sultans), first as a body guard and then as an army corps of picked troops; again to hold his conquests he created a new feudalism, the timar fief being its unit, the equivalent of the Western knight's fee. It was non-hereditary, a military outpost and holding; and it enabled the Sultan to protect, under military occupation, the new

lands he ravaged and took. These territories were divided immediately upon capture into fiefs and thus feudalised; the Turk was no longer a vagrant horde but a people deliberately moving West. Meanwhile a civil war in Byzantium between John V (Paleologus) and John Cantacuzenos opened a road to the Turk. Orkan had already besieged Nicæa, had defeated the emperor in person at Pelekanon (1329), and had captured Nicæa (1330), slowly during ten years gathering up his conquests till he had absorbed almost the whole of Asia Minor. He now realised clearly that the Greeks were too divided to meet him fairly, and he saw that Stephen Dushan, by revolt King of Servia (1333), was gradually driving the Byzantines out of all their European territories, while the Turk was stripping them of their Asiatic lands.

Again the long quarrel between Venice and Genoa was similarly weakening both the republics, and confirming the Turk in his judgement that there was little likelihood of any effective crusade against him whatever he might do. He had only to wait patiently. All would be his in time. In 1354 an earthquake shook down the walls of many Byzantine cities, amongst others Gallipoli; in the confusion it was immediately occupied by the Turks, who have never been dislodged from it.

In 1355 Stephen Dushan died and his territories were divided; on that side therefore the Turks found that they had no more to fear.

In 1381 the emperor, finding the Papacy unable to rouse the West to his aid, agreed to pay tribute to the Turks and to allow them to occupy Thessalonica.

In 1389 the Bosnians were defeated at Kossovo, the sister of their king was given in marriage to Bajazet I, Bulgaria annexed, Wallachia forced to pay tribute, and the Bosnians themselves turned Mohammedan to save their lands. Alone of the Balkan states Bosnia has still many Moslem inhabitants, whose religion dates from this time. In 1396 Sigismund, then only King of Hungary, and his Crusaders were defeated at Nicopolis.

In 1397 Epirus and Thessaly fell to the Turk and siege was laid to Constantinople; and that it was saved was not due to Greek prowess, but to the fact that the Turk himself was in difficulties.

In 1402 Bajazet the Sultan was captured and his army destroyed by Tamerlane from the further East at the battle of Angora. But no efforts were made by the West to use this destruction of the Turk to recover the lost territories of the neighbouring powers. Hungary under Sigismund was only interested in its western and northern borders, and Venice was busy fighting for her westward expansion. Of all the powers, while the Seljuk Turks were endeavouring in Asia Minor to regain their strength, only the Emperor Manuel bestirred himself. He recaptured Thessalonica and parts of Thessaly and Epirus, giving to Soleyman (one of the sons of Bajazet) at Adrianople, in exchange for his conquests, a free passage over the Bosphorus.

But in 1430 Thessalonica was retaken by Amurath, the new Sultan of the Ottoman Turks.

In 1442 two Turkish armies were beaten off Belgrade.

In 1443 King Ladislas of Poland and Hungary, under the brilliant generalship of Hunyadi, defeated the Turks at Nissa and recovered Servia, Bosnia and Wallachia by the treaty of Szegedin (1444).

In 1444, repudiating their treaty the allies attacked Amurath who destroyed them at Varna, Ladislas and Card. Cesarini being slain and Hunyadi escaping. The Turks thus recaptured all the Balkans at one blow (save for Albania which was defended by the magical successes of George Castriot or Scanderbeg, a reconverted janissary who fought the armies of Amurath from 1445-1447).

In 1451 (to 1481) Mohammed II (the Conqueror) succeeded, cruel, but an organiser and soldier; he attacked Constantinople, now weak without and divided within, a city of 100,000 inhabitants, whose trade was not in their own hands, who would not enter their own Cathedral now that at Florence it had been reconciled to the Catholic faith, and where the Roman Mass was now said. Constantine IX, the Emperor, the greatest of the Paleologi, had indeed accepted the papal supremacy, but he suffered in this last hour for all the follies and sins of the Schism of his house.

In 1453 war was openly declared by the Greeks, who were

forced into it by the pulling down of a Church by Mohammed to block the entrance to the Black Sea. Turkish cannon were planted at Adrianople and ships and horse assembled north of the city. Constantinople itself had a garrison of 3,000; Venice and Genoa could have thrown 20,000 more men into the city, but they were too afraid of each other's treachery to venture on this; and even of the Greeks only 2,000 volunteered to fight in the city's defence.

In 1453 formal siege began, the defenders being Constantine, the Genoese under Giustiniani, and the Venetians. The only Christian success was at sea and was due to the Genoese; this solitary gleam delayed, but could not avert, the city's doom. Mohammed weakened the sea-front of the Golden Horn with his cannon, and by launching his vessels from its upper end, divided the garrison which had to be split into two sections to defend both the sea-front as well as the land walls. Finally, a breach was made by the gate of S. Romanus in the north-east corner of the city. On May 29th Constantine took communion from a Latin priest, asked pardon of all and went with Giustiniani to defend the breach in the wall. Twelve thousand janissaries attacked it in waves, but they were defeated and thrown back by the heavily armed knights. The twelfth attack however was successful, Giustiniani was wounded and the emperor slain; both the Genoese and Venetians escaped from the city, but Giustiniani died. The body of the emperor was identified by the golden eagles on his shoes. The great Delphic tripod, which had been dedicated after the victory of Greece over Persis at Plataea (439 B.C.) and was one of the most splendid treasures of the city, was captured and solemnly struck by Mohammed. Asia was avenged.

The results of the capture of Constantinople:

- (i) Many of the Greeks emigrated to Italy or Russia.
- (ii) The Turks now possessed a naval arsenal and became a sea-power.
- (iii) The Turks holding Constantinople now blocked the West from all Eastern trade overland.

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

Meanwhile the steady christianisation of Spain and Portugal was to provide not only forces strong enough to deal successfully with the infidel, but even adventurers enough to find a way out of the strangling difficulty of the blocked trade-route to the East.

A. In 1230 *Castile* had been permanently united with Leon. In the political organisation of this double kingdom there were three estates—the clergy whose official importance was probably due to the crusading origins of the State, the nobles whose achievements had been more directly military and more continuous to a later date than elsewhere, and the cities which owed their independence to their own individual efforts against the infidel. Its kings to be noted were:

Alfonso X (the Wise), 1252-1284, the conqueror of the province of Murcia and the rival of Richard of Cornwall for the empire. After his death years of anarchy followed.

Alfonso XI (1312-1350), who relieved Tarifa which the Moors, encouraged by this anarchy, had besieged, and defeated the Emirs of Fez and Granada at the battle of Salado in 1340.

Peter the Cruel (1350-1369), murderer of his half-brothers and his wife, only to be murdered by another half-brother who succeeded him; his treachery to the Black Prince was of no service to him, for he lost at Montiel (1369) all that had been won at Najara (1367) by the Prince's veterans. One daughter married John of Gaunt and the other Edmund Duke of York, and figures as the "old Duchess" in Shakespeare's *Richard II*.

Henry III (1390-1406), who married the daughter of John of Gaunt, whose other daughter was married to John I of Portugal. Between Portugal and Castile were interminable wars.

John II (1406-1454), who was chiefly important because of his complete subservience to Alvaro de Luna, Constable of Castile, whose policy included:

(i) The reduction of the privileges of the nobles.

(ii) The reduction of the number of cities represented in the Cortes to seventeen.

Henry IV (1454-1474), who ended the period of disintegration; his daughter Joanna (alleged to have been really the

daughter of his favourite Beltran de la Cuera and called therefore Joanna la Beltraneja) never succeeded him, but his sister Isabella was recognised by him as his heir. She married Ferdinand of Aragon who was himself the grandson of an earlier Ferdinand of Aragon, the brother of Henry III, who was Isabella's grand-father. The inter-marriages of the three generations seem to have been deliberately planned to secure what ultimately befell when Castile and Aragon became one through the marriage of the two royalties.

B. In *Aragon*, the powers of the Crown were far more seriously limited than in Castile, where only the failure of the monarchy produced the *hermandads* of cities or leagues to establish peace. But in Aragon—

(i) The nobles had considerable feudal privileges.

(ii) The towns were represented in the Cortes from the first quarter of the twelfth century.

(iii) These Cortes had supreme jurisdiction and powers of taxation within each province, Aragon, Catalonia, and Valencia.

(iv) In Aragon the justiciar was the supreme arbiter of all disputes between the king and his subjects; he could only be elected from the lesser nobility.

Here the chief names of kings to be remembered are:

James I (1213-1276), who annexed Valencia and the Balearic Islands and was famous as the conqueror of the Moors.

Peter III (1276-1285), who was chiefly important as the husband of Constance, the daughter and heiress of Manfred, and so of the house of Hohenstaufen. After the Sicilian Vespers, on the invitation of the Sicilians, he succeeded through his wife to that island Crown. After much disputing, his heirs established their claim to the kingdoms of Sicily and Sardinia.

Alfonso III (1285-1291), who was famous for his grant of the *Privilege of Union* (1287), by which the right of his subjects to rebel against any royal infringement of the General Privilege (granted by Peter III in 1283) was formally acknowledged. This document was destroyed fifty years later by King Peter IV after

his defeat of the nobles, who were led by his half-brother James of Urzel, in the battle of Epila in 1348.

Ferdinand of Aragon (1412-1416), was remarkable

(a) As having been chosen by a committee of the Cortes of the three provinces to succeed after the death of Martin I (1410). He had legally less rights than the other two claimants.

(b) As having had two sons, one of whom became King of Naples and the other King of Navarre. The elder was Alfonso who captured and succeeded Joanna of Naples; the younger was John who married Blanche the daughter and heiress of Charles II of Navarre, patron of letters and the arts. John succeeded his brother Alfonso in Naples and Aragon, and to these added his wife's kingdom of Navarre, losing only Roussillon and Cerdagne (to Louis XI of France, who demanded them as the price of his abstention) in the midst of a critical fight with his son, who had the legal right to the throne on his mother's death.

The provinces of Roussillon and Cerdagne were restored in 1493; save for them John at his death in 1479 left to his son Ferdinand, the undiminished sovereignties of Aragon, Sicily and Naples. Navarre meanwhile went to his daughter Eleanor who had married Gaston de Foix; through her grand-child Catharine, the heritage of Navarre passed to the family of d'Albret and, through another heiress, Jeanne de d'Albret, to the house of Bourbon and so to Henry IV of France. In 1659 Roussillon and Cerdagne reverted again to France.

C. *Portugal* rose to a kingship under Alfonso I (1112-1185) and to complete separation from Spain at the battle of Aljubarrota (1385) under John I (1383-1433). John's mother was the daughter of John of Gaunt, and his son Henry the Navigator was, therefore, the grand-son of an English Duke.

Henry's discoveries were—

1414 Cabo Blanco,

1419 Porto Santo,

1420 Madeira,

1431 The Azores,

1446 Cape Verde.

Then Portugal pushed further out on the adventure of discovery and sent—

1486 Bartholomew Diaz to Algoa Bay;

1498 Vasco da Gama to Calicut.

Thus was the fall of Constantinople outbalanced by the discovery of new trade-routes to the East.

IRELAND


In this growing development of nationality Ireland had its part. At the beginning of the twelfth century there had been a prospect of a Norman Conquest of the island which might (as it did elsewhere) have settled and unified the people; the Norman forces intermittently supported from Wales and England, continued for a while to hold their own and even to spread their conquests. But after the arrival of Robert Bruce and his brother Edward in 1316, the failure of this Norman adventure was not only evident but publicly admitted. Robert Bruce had hoped to fight in Ireland another Bannockburn; he was supported by the vast majority of the Irish and won eighteen victories over the Anglo-Normans; and then he returned home, leaving Edward Bruce to complete the liberation of the country.

Edward, over-confident in the past successes of his brother, fought foolishly and was slain. But though the policy of the Bruce was unsuccessful, the decay of the Anglo-Norman supremacy had begun. The victories of the Bruce had shown to the Irish the possibility of organised revolt, and to the Anglo-Normans the perpetual possibility of being successfully attacked. This possibility of its failure to hold the country was admitted in the new policy adopted towards Ireland by the English Crown, namely that only defensive measures were now undertaken to protect what yet remained to it of its Irish territory. The Statute of Kilkenny in 1366 forbade—

- (i) Intermarriage between the Kelts and Anglo-Normans.
- (ii) Trade intercourse between them.
- (iii) Irish dress, language and customs to those who lived within the limits of the Crown's jurisdiction.

IRELAND

ABOUT 1400



A little earlier when the Duke of Clarence went to Ireland (1361), neither Kelts nor Anglo-Irish were allowed to come near his camp.

Later again, a statute under Edward IV made the colonists of the Pale undertake all the duties of their own local government, which implicitly was now renounced by the English sovereign. Every man had to become a law for himself, because he could no longer be protected in his rights by anyone else. Not that this relaxing of the central government was unpopular amongst the dominant party in the Pale, since most of the viceroys had been grossly incompetent. Earlier than this Richard of York, the King's father, had been the most popular viceroy in Ireland, because he was a man of character who ruled forcibly and well. His popularity descended to his son, and his party of the White Rose held Ireland for the Yorkists. In 1459 Duke Richard as Viceroy had passed a declaratory act asserting the complete independence of the Irish Parliament and Judiciary from the English Parliament and judicature. The inevitable result was that under Henry VII efforts were made to destroy the Anglo-Normans whom he looked upon as being on the side of his opponents. Poyning's Law of 1495 was introduced to remove all power of initiation from the Irish Parliament, and to establish English legislation in full as legally binding in Ireland.

However, in fact, the change made was not very great, for the Irish Parliaments had hardly ever been of much importance. At times far reaching statutes had been passed, as that of Kilkenny, others that forbade "cogne and livery," or put down the Irish mercenary troops, or fined absentee landlords, or imposed the feudal laws and removed the brehon laws. The Parliaments were curiously composed. The writs for some of them summoned members from beyond the Pale, and under the three Edwards even Irish representatives had been summoned to the English Parliaments. But it had never been constitutionally established that this was legal; there were always protests against this attendance in Westminster from the native Irish and the Irish of the Pale.

THE NEW ARTS

Of greater significance than these military and political events were the discoveries of new arts. From 1250 Christendom entered a new field, more richly developed and more stimulating to the mind than the austere and simple art of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In these centuries which were, as far as the people were concerned, years of peace, the population increased in numbers and trade developed more steadily and more quickly. To regulate the rights of traders on land and sea a "law merchant" had to be discovered and books written to interpret it. With trade came the dawn of the "capitalist" (or money-lender as he was then called), first the Jew, and then the Lombard (or Coursine, because the first of these Lombard bankers settled in Cahors) whose name survives in Lombard street in the city of London and elsewhere. These bankers, like the other traders, formed themselves into guilds, partly to ensure that the members of the craft should be duly trained in their craft, partly to prevent bad workmanship or inadequate hours of work, partly to regulate the trade and to prevent interlopers getting into these close corporations. At first these guilds, when every man was invited to join them, fulfilled valuable economic purposes, as well as social, religious and artistic. Only later they were captured by the wealthier members, who shut out the poorer workers of the guild and governed the trade in their own interests.

With trade came literature of all sorts, the development of scholasticism, sermons and chronicles, romances in the vulgar tongues and stories of the growing nationalities, in Irish, Welsh, in French, English, Spanish and Italian—the Sagas of the North for instance and the Arthurian legends, the Song of Roland and the Poem of the Cid. Not indeed that as yet French was a single language spoken by all in France, or that the Catalan and Provençal (though the languages of separate nationalities now) were not very much the same; but merely that local dialects were becoming dignified means of cultural expression, the *dolce stil nuovo* of Dante. The best known, perhaps, in French are **Aucassin et Nicolette* (thirteenth century), †*Roman de la Rose* (the first part by

*A good edition by Mason in 1910.

†Edited by F. S. Ellis in 1908.

William de Louis, about 1220, the second by Jean de Meung about 1270), and the *Roman de Renart* (about 1200) and in Norman English the *Jew Adam*, and the *Chronicles of Wace*. Later came the troubadours of Provence, the sonnet-writers who followed Guittone d'Arezo, the poets who echoed S. Francis's Cantic of the Sun, the hymn writers like Jacopone da Todi, preachers like Giordano da Pisa, and the great names of Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio. Those who wrote at the beginning of the period are as different from those who wrote at its close as these last are different from us. Architecturally the change is more easy to follow, the old Lombard, heavy and barbaric, then the Norman with its wooden roofs, then the early Gothic in which the Norman solidity becomes lightened, as successively unnecessary masonry was cut away to the finest margin of safety, till only the essential lines are left and show. To the Gothic taste, the first requisite of which was truth, the business of the architect included an obligation to show the eye how all his weights were carried and his thrusts met. He had to give the uncovered skeleton of his Church, but a skeleton that was intensely alive. We can follow the working of these architects in the scrap-book of Villard de Honnecourt* with its drawings of existing churches, its plans of churches to be built, and its sketches from nature of flowers, beasts and men.

Mosaics, frescoes, stained-glass, the gold-smith's art, metal-work, enamels, illuminated manuscripts, are evidences of a growing facility with tools, and a clearer sense of natural forms and a determination, deliberate and expressly defended, neither to display emotion (though willing to provoke it) nor to copy in sheer realism the mere objects seen. Art was a handicraft, and the fine arts were the handicrafts of men lit with beauty because the workman was pleased with his work, and his happiness shone out in the radiance and joy of his accomplishment.

*Published by the Walpole Society.

CHAPTER VI

THE ITALIAN RECOVERY

IN the days of Charlemagne, Italy counted for very little in Europe except in so far as old Rome still influenced all culture, and as the Catholic Church inspired in fact the revival of the empire and the defence of Christendom against its pagan enemies. By the time, however, that the descendants of Charlemagne were surrendering their power in the west of Europe to the house of Capet and in the north to the Ottos, Italy had become a place whither men turned to look for the leadership of the Faith. To the Ottos and to their immediate successors, and to the Hohenstaufen, Italy was evidently the pivot of ambition; however distracting and fatal might prove this lure, it is clear that it existed.

After the fall of the Hohenstaufen, came the effective hegemony of France. The Middle Ages that followed were in spirit and in idea Frankish. France, though politically dismembered, taught England which was politically one, taught her not how to rule or the secrets of government, but the theories of government and the massed principles of art, literature, and the philosophy of the Faith. From Ireland, the torch had been passed by England to the Germanies (as Charlemagne gathered them to him at Metz and Aachen), and thence had been brought to Paris; indeed it is truer no doubt to say that it was Paris rather than France that inspired the second period of the Middle Ages; at its close (nearly the first quarter or half of the fifteenth century) Italy had taken from Paris the light that was to illumine the next generations. The Renaissance (as the next period was called) was essentially the recovery by Italy of her place as the breeding ground of ideas and ideals in Christendom. We are not to think

of this as a military or political domination over Christendom on the part of Italy; she did not win wars or even make war: she did something much more difficult, much more worth while doing, and much richer in fruitfulness—she convinced public opinion that her spirit was more alive and more quickening than the now worn-out dialectic of Paris.

The early Middle Ages of the period after Charlemagne's were inspired by logic and by the beauty, as of a delicate etching, that logic can train the mind to notice; the later Middle Ages are touched by a more developed sense of beauty, fuller, richer, as of a tree no longer bare in the winter with its delicate tracery of twig and branch outlined against the sky, but ample with foliage and giving to the eye a sense of richness, completion and satiety. That is the Italian gift, nearer to old Rome (as France had been nearer to old Greece), not logic but letters, not thought but life, not dreams but man. France played a large part in this new age, so did England, so did the Germanies and the Netherlands, so did Spain; but the idea that these other countries taught were ideas learnt from the Italians. Note here after 1400 we take these nations for granted; our last period saw them coming into life.

THE CONCILIAR MOVEMENT

In dealing with the Conciliar movement which was threatening to engulf the Church by giving it a merely Parliamentary government, it is necessary to note carefully its primary causes. It was a revolt from the autocratic system that the Papacy had been unconsciously developing in Christendom. Yet this revolt against autocracy was not altogether a democratic revolt. It certainly coincided in point of time with a popular movement all over Europe. In England at the same date, the house of Lancaster was forced into accepting its position as a constitutional government in order to give a reason for its oversetting the absolutist policy of Richard II. Its title to the crown was indeed a popular title, but it rested upon a Parliamentary grant; elsewhere, as we have already stated, in France, Germany, Bohemia, Florence, etc., the waves of a peasant revolt were even more observable. But the Councils of Pisa and Constance were not of this nature;

in them the revolt against the Papacy was almost entirely aristocratic. It originated from the bishops and other local ordinaries who found their powers being steadily modified and curtailed by the growing importance of the pope. The highly centralised system of government under Innocent III and Innocent IV had meant that case after case of ecclesiastical moment was evoked from the local to the central courts. The archives of the Vatican bear witness to the extraordinary number of appeals which were made to the Apostolic See. Even suits at the first instance now went direct to the Roman Curia, passing over the heads of the ordinary officials. Whether this was a system which made for efficiency, uniformity, and impartiality has little bearing on the particular question. The main fact to notice is that this roused the animosity of the bishops and prelates who found their powers thus greatly diminished. Their courts were sinking in importance: and the loss of cases meant the loss of revenue by way of fees. The rights of patronage were also being more and more encroached upon through the increase of papal provisions.* The statutes of Edward III and Richard II in England against this practice were really futile, for the kings went behind Parliament and compromised with the popes on their own terms. So too was it elsewhere: but the popes, the kings, and the provided clerics were the only parties pleased. The patrons, whether ecclesiastical or lay, for motives not wholly selfish or interested, felt that an injustice was being done them and were being irritated by the aggravation of these evils.

Nicholas de Clemengese (d. 1435), secretary to the anti-pope Benedict XIII, put these gravamina into pithy language: "The rights of bishops and patrons are set at naught. . . The claims of the popes for first fruits or first year's revenue on presentation to a benefice and other duties have been intolerable. . . Ecclesiastical causes are drawn into the papal court on every kind of pretext, and judgment is given in favour of those who pay most" (*De Ruina Ecclesiæ*).

*The right and practice of the Popes of appointing their own nominees to benefices throughout Christendom, over the heads of the patrons of these benefices, or against the will of those who had the right to elect them.

What also helped on the conciliar movement, was the growth of national feeling. The old political ideal of a common Roman heritage, continued and administered by the Pontifex Maximus and the Cæsar, had, as we have seen, broken down hopelessly. Enthusiasts like Dante still thought they saw the glory of this golden vision. But to the greater part of Europe, the empire had become an outworn institution. Sigismund might indeed seem to be acting anew the historic position of a Holy Roman emperor, when he assembled œcumenical councils that were at the same time Diets of the empire. But it was the man, rather than the office, which produced the passing success. In effect the nations were now too far apart to join even for an occasional crusade. So long before, as in 1338, as we have shown, a general congress of electors met at Rense to protest against papal interference in imperial affairs. This was the first occasion when the electors had met to perform corporate functions other than filling a vacancy on the throne. Then too in Bohemia, in the university contest at Prague, the nationalist movement had showed itself. In France and the Spanish kingdoms, in the little Italian States and cities, in the Cantons of Switzerland there was a growing sentiment of patriotism. In England, due no doubt to the physical conditions of isolation, this spirit was received in its fulness: and in each country the university represented the voice of the nation, and the university in each case gave no uncertain sound. In 1369 the Chancellor of Oxford ordered a proclamation to be made expelling all foreign students, religious and secular, from the city. It was published at Carfax. But the climax of the whole movement was reached when the Fathers of General Councils began to vote their *placet* and *non-placet*, not singly, as prelates of the Church, but grouped into nations. Yet in the end it was this, the very nationalist strength of the conciliar movement, that broke it and made it impotent.

A further motive force to the spreading revolt lay in *the moral state of the Church*. Many of those who later broke off from the Holy See, spoke in vehement terms of the vicious lives of the clergy, and of the rottenness that was causing moral decay, even in the high places. But strong as their words sounded, they were

moderate enough compared with what canonised saints, who clung in their very despair to the papal theory, have left recorded. S. Vincent Ferrer and S. Catharine of Siena described in frank terms the immorality that prevailed. If to read their sermons and letters now is sufficient to fill us with disgust, we can guess what must have been the effect of the sight of this immorality on those who had full view of it. If S. Catharine could write that "the depths of calamity have overwhelmed the Church," how must it not have appeared to those whose faith was less robust than hers? The need of reform, and the hopelessness of seeking it from Rome in its broken state, drove many to try to set up some other power strong enough to cope with these terrible conditions. Hence men turned to a General Council as the hope for the world.

Moreover this idea of a council, which was to do what the popes could not or would not, was recommended and defended by the best writers of the day. The names of Peter D'Ailly, Gerson, and Filastre (leaders of this revolt) stood high in the academic world. The treatises of Occam, Langenstein's *Concilium Pacis* of 1389, and the *Defensor Pacis* of Marsiglio were still remembered. It is true that between these and the newer heresies there was a difference. The literary wealth of the previous epoch had been employed to put the Emperôr above the Pope. The State and the community were to be everything; the Church was to be pushed into the background. She was to have no legislature, no judicature, no possessions. This too was the logical climax of the teaching of Wycliffe. But a more subtle ideal lay concealed in the conciliar movement. It was not intended to exalt the material over the spiritual, but pointed to the whole Church as supreme. It took the ideals of the anti-papalists and transferred them from the empire that had failed, to a Council that seemed to them a protection against failure. It took the ideals of the papalists and transferred them too, to the Council, as alone able to judge when a dispute had arisen in the Papacy itself. It sketched thus deliberately an outline of ecclesiastical polity:

- (i) In the whole Church lay the plentitude of power;
- (ii) Of this power the Pope was to be the highest executive;
- (iii) The Cardinals a standing committee; and

(iv) The Council a representative body of the *Ecclesia docens* and *discens* (the clergy and the laity).

Lastly, the conciliar movement's final strength lay in the Schism itself. The spectacle of two men claiming the tremendous powers of the Viceregent of Christ was bound to shock and cause scandal to the minds of many. A generation had passed since it began, and the Schism yet remained. Neither promises under oath nor force had been able to reunite the two halves of Christendom. The first attempt at union had only added a third to the papal claimants. In spite of this failure of the Council of Pisa, the theory of a General Council, as a constitutional check on the Papacy, combined to find supporters. The Emperor Rupert had written a letter to the cardinals which questioned their authority. He asked how it was that if the popes were doubtful, the cardinals were not doubtful also—and he showed at once the weakness of the Pisan council. Hence its original theory had to be abandoned. The council no longer set up to be a mere tribunal that had power to judge which was the true pope, for this was not enough. It had to take its stand on a higher ground. It asserted that it had the inherent power—only to be exercised in extreme cases, but yet perfectly available—of deposing popes absolutely from their position. Even S. Vincent Ferrer taught that the danger to the Church was so great that it was within the power of united Christendom to put away and degrade every papal claimant, and to proceed to an entirely new election—not on the ground of the ambiguity or doubtfulness of the former elections, but on the ground that, for grave cause, even a valid election could be set aside by a General Council as null and void. As regards this change of front, Gerson afterwards confessed “that nothing but the confused state of opinion consequent upon a season of protracted Schism could have brought the council to set aside the doctrine of papal supremacy, which had heretofore been universally accepted.”

This was the final point of the evolution of the conciliar theory. It was successful up to Constance, for Pisa showed no more than that the theory had not yet had a fair opportunity of showing what it could do, for it was urged with reason that by mistake that

council had not been sufficiently œcumenical. Even before this, the theory of the supremacy of the council over the Pope had been played with by Frederick II and Lewis the Bavarian for obvious reasons of their own; but it was the writings of Marsiglio of Padua and his friends that gave most colour to the ideas of D'Ailly with his view of an historical Jerusalem, and of Gerson with his theory of the supremacy of natural law over statute law, of the fundamental purposes of the Church that prevailed over the positive establishment of the Papacy by Christ. Yet, as we have seen, the movement was shattered at Bâle. The Fathers went there feeling that there was a popular desire in the Church at that time, to see General Councils become the permanent method of government, at least equal to the Papacy; when they separated it was evident to everyone that a General Council was an abnormal expedient and must remain inferior to the Papacy.

How did this change come about? It will be remembered that the *Council of Bâle* met under a bequest. It was a legacy of Constance. Its composition was determined by a committee of twelve chosen from its number who readily admitted anybody and everybody who cared to come, so that the membership of the council was perpetually changing and could easily be engineered. At first the council had Italian political backing and began with the appearance of success, because it was patronised by the Visconti and the Colonna; on the papal side and against the council, it is true, were both Venice and the Orsini; but when the council began, both of these were politically in an unstable condition. Again, another advantage was gained when it was able to arrange the *compactata* with the Hussites and claim the ending of that problem as its doing. It now set out to secure the co-operation, and above all the presence at its sessions, of the Greeks who were coming to the West to get what aid they could against the Turks in the last fight for Byzantium.

It was here, however, that the council was worsted. (i) Geographically it could not offer the Greeks a convenient meeting place. (ii) Financially it was obvious that it might not be able to redeem its promise to pay their expenses during the sitting of the council.

Moreover, the Pope by approving of the *Compactata* had himself now become the centre of unity with the reconciled Hussites; he was able to offer to the Greeks an Italian city, and could promise that their expenses would be paid out of the issue of indulgences which would command the offerings of Christendom. A parchment strip of one of these "indulgences", with the spaces for the name and amount of the offering left blank, has lately been found at a sale of manuscripts in England. This particular one was published for the Bishop of London for his diocese and is dated 1433.

Moreover, the council was deserted by the lay powers, who turned instead to negotiating pragmatic sanctions with Eugenius IV, the French at Bourges in 1438, the Germans at Mainz in 1439; these concordats gave the national governments at least as much as they could have hoped for from the council, so that the two nations that had done most to set it up in Bâle, were no longer interested in maintaining it. In anger at the loss of its chief supporters, the council went to the extreme measure of deposing Eugenius, an undoubted pope, and substituting for him Felix V, Duke Amadeus of Savoy. This was the final blow to what little prestige yet remained to it. Only seven bishops were present at the deposition of Eugenius; and the election of Felix had been voted by only one cardinal and eleven bishops. Moreover, the choice of a temporal prince, who was only a layman, for the most sacred see in Christendom outraged public opinion even more. After this there could be no longer any pretence that the council was on the side of reform or unity, or even that the holding of a General Council gave any hope for the better government of the Church.

Meanwhile Eugenius had opened his council at Ferrara in 1438 and almost immediately, on the outbreak of plague, transferred it to *Florence*. To this the Greeks came, astonished at the artistic glories of the "barbarians", and astonishing these "barbarians" by their painted eyebrows and their ignorance of the classics. The chief points of discussion between Greeks and Latins were (i) the use of the *filioque* clause "who proceedeth from the Father and the Son" in the Creed which had been added to the

original creed of Nicæa; (ii) the use of unleaven bread at Mass; (iii) the primacy of S. Peter's successors in the See of Rome.

Finally, though somewhat grudgingly, the terms of the Latins were accepted by the Greeks, i.e., by the Emperor, the patriarch of Constantinople (who died during the council and lies buried in the Duomo), and the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. Alexandria, represented by Bishop Mark of Ephesus, alone refused to sign the articles of union. The real and central point of discussion was undoubtedly the primacy of the Pope, for the Latin Church never made any difficulty in allowing to Eastern groups within her communion the use of leaven bread, and the *filioque* dispute was rather about the use of a particular word than about its meaning. In the council then, the primacy of S. Peter and his successors was definitely and finally accepted by East and West. From that time on, 1439, the Western bishops were obliged to accept the newly determined doctrine as well as were the Greeks. Four hundred and forty years later the infallibility of that Papacy was also defined. The Council of the Vatican in 1870 completed the work of the Council of Florence in 1439. Despite the Schism and the Avignon captivity, the popes were now more powerful spiritually than they had ever been. Even temporally Eugenius IV (1431-1447) recovered his importance.

(i) After living for years in Florence at the expense of the Medici, in 1443 he turned triumphantly to Rome.

(ii) The Visconti and France both accepted him.

(iii) Aragon was placated by his recognition of its rule in Naples.

(iv) Frederick III, the new Hapsburg Emperor, was won over by Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who had left Bâle with Cardinal Cesarini and Nicholas of Cusa to make his peace with the Pope, and was now in Germany as the papal legate. Piccolomini had been given a free hand to deal with the German princes and bishops, and he suggested terms, other than those Eugenius had given him, assuring the Germans that Eugenius would not disapprove of his alterations. Nor did he. Though he died in 1447, Eugenius had accepted the protocol which was signed in 1448 by his successor *Nicholas V* (Thomas of Sar-

zana), famous in his day as a collector of books and as a librarian.

The work of Nicholas (1447-1455) was not very distinctive, except for his founding of the Vatican Library. He succeeded to the strong position bequeathed to him by Eugenius, and he handed it on to *Callixtus III* of Aragon (1455-1458) even more firmly held, for he had met and beaten down the conspiracy of Stefano Porcaro, another of the attempts made at intervals by the Romans to establish again the popular government of the ancient republic. The name of Callixtus is chiefly now remembered for his share in the defence of Belgrade under Hunyadi against the Turks, and in the dispersal of the Turkish forces in 1456. He also began that unhappy practice of the Renaissance popes of appointing their relations to the cardinalates, and his use of it seems worst of all, for he himself bore the ominous name of Borgia and one of his nephews thus promoted (his sister's son who changed his name from Lenzuoli to Borgia) was Rodrigo, later famous or infamous as Alexander VI.

To Callixtus III followed Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, under the title of *Pius II* (1458-1464). He had grown in maturity during the years that followed on the Council of Bâle. Under preceding popes, he had acted for them as legate and knew Europe perhaps better than any other of the Italian cardinals; he had even visited Scotland (he always, afterwards, blamed his going bare foot on pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady at Candida Casa near Dumfries as being the beginning of his rheumatic gout) and yet, as a scholar of the classic learning, was affected by the glories of old Rome. Versed in politics though he was, and a cynic in his ideas of policy ("you cannot tell the whole truth either to a tyrant or a people"), he did not realise the altered conditions of his age, for he called a Congress at Mantua for all the princes of the West—who no longer conscious of Christian unity, but only of national independence, would not come—and he summoned a crusade to meet him at Ancona, and found himself there alone. Just as he was dying in his castle in Ancona, men sighted Venetian ships riding into the bay; indomitable, he had himself lifted in his stretcher to the window, gazed at the sails and

rigging and the pomp of war, and then died, perhaps unconscious of his failure and hoping for the return of impossible things.

THE GROWTH OF NEPOTISM

Paul II (1464-1471), a Venetian (Pietro Barbo) had been a merchant in early life, turned priest when his uncle Eugenius IV was elected Pope, and was Pope himself at the age of forty-eight. His reign was followed by that of *Sixtus IV* (1471-1484), who plunged still deeper into nepotism, giving the cardinalate to one nephew, Guiliano della Rovere (later to become Julius II), marrying another, Giovanni della Rovere to the daughter of Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino and a third, Girolamo Riario, to Catherine, daughter of Galeazzo Maria Sforza, and thus securing for his family the Papacy and two Dukedoms.

The Pope's foreign policy consisted in endeavouring to oust from Florence the Medici whose growing power he dreaded; here he nearly succeeded by patronising the Pazzi who rose in revolt against the Medici in 1478, and murdered Guiliano in the Cathedral during Mass and only by chance missed murdering Lorenzo as well—the two sons of Cosimo who between them ruled the State. Finding he had failed there, Sixtus now turned to get territory for his nephews from Venice or from Naples, indifferent as to whether this was done in alliance with them or by intriguing against them, without much conscience but also without success. When all his wars failed him, he died; his disrespectful subjects said that "he died of peace."

Innocent VIII (1484-1492) had not merely nephews to provide for but children, born to him before he was a priest; his nepotism however was intensified by his exploitation by the house of Medici (a daughter of the house marrying one of the Pope's sons), through whom Giovanni de Medici became a cardinal at fourteen. Later he was to ascend the papal throne as Leo X. Innocent had also, like Sixtus, his foreign intrigues as well as his home ambitions; but they served him as ill as Sixtus's had done. More constant in his policy, he consistently opposed Naples and favoured Florence and Venice; but he had no very important schemes in mind, even in regard to Naples against which most of

his plans were directed. He wished to substitute Angevins for the house of Aragon on the throne, not from any love of France, but merely because Aragon had failed to pay its tribute to him. He died leaving the King of Naples in undisturbed possession, not living long enough to see the claims of France made on Naples; and dying was followed on the papal throne by Rodrigo Borgia, *Alexander VI* (1492-1503).

The name of Alexander VI was so infamous for the many evils of his reign—his own unsavoury life, the scandals of the papal court, the infamies of Cesare Borgia, the ill-legend of Lucrezia (who is now proved at least to have ended her life not only pious but dull), the persecution of *Savonarola*—that in his reign the secularisation of the Papacy seemed to have been complete.

Innocent III with his world vision of the Papacy, was far removed from these who aimed at little more than becoming successful despots of a petty Italian principedom; not only their lives but their shrunken ambitions would have shocked gravely the ideals of the Gregories. Yet something might be said even for the aims of these pontiffs. Even were it admitted that they tried to obtain merely the headship of the Italian states and neglected the larger world vision of their predecessors, still this was due as much to the temper of the times as to the characters of the individual popes. When Sixtus IV succeeded to the Papacy, it was said of him "This Pope evidently intends to be on good terms with every one." He sent embassies to Florence, Venice and Naples and wrote letters to the Christian princes begging them to have peace and concord. It was only when the old traditional policy had failed that the Pope took up the new Italian and secular spirit. It was because he had discovered that the temporal power of the Holy See was weak, and that, till he could make himself properly independent, he would have to depend on one prince or another, that he turned to the new principles of his fellow Italian rulers and struggled for the mastery of the other balanced powers of the peninsula. When Julius II threatened the Venetian Ambassador, "I will make Venice a little fishing-village again," Pisani replied, "Unless you are reasonable, Holy Father, we will make you a little parish priest." There was truth in the

remark, for the popes had now come on an age when no other argument than might could obtain a hearing. They plotted now in a society, which seemed unable to produce other political theorists than Machiavelli and Cesare Borgia, the *Prince* of the one and the deeds of the other. Nor were even the spiritual weapons of the Papacy sure of having an effect, owing, it may be—in a large measure—to the abuse of them by the popes themselves. But by whosoever's fault it had been brought about, there was a spirit abroad which mocked at the ideal of a Christian polity. Infessura indeed declaimed against Sixtus IV, "See on what things the Church's treasure is spent!"; and Trevisan declared of Julius II "He is determined to be Lord and Master of the World's game"; but it hardly seemed to sagacious councillors that any other policy was possible, as things then stood. It was no doubt a matter of regret that the voice of the Vicar of Christ was seldom heard beyond Italian politics, but (ran the argument) how could he hope to produce any effect beyond his borders until he had first strengthened his own position as *sovereign of the States of the Church*? When Sixtus IV sounded a crusade, his words fell on unresponsive listeners. The whole of central Christendom had been greatly debased, and had become utterly deaf to any of those higher aspirations which had stirred the earlier generations. To a large extent then, it was argued, the wars in which the popes indulged were wars of self-defence rather than aggression. At least this was the case especially with Sixtus IV and his nephew Julius II, the latter of whom had to reunite the papal States that had been broken up into princedoms and squandered on the Borgia. In the apt phrase of Burckhardt (Alexander's gossiping master of ceremonies), Julius had to choose his part, "either as anvil or as hammer." And even this secularisation of the Papacy was not so complete as is often suspected. The bulls and decrees issued on Church discipline by the most worldly of the popes were certainly numerous. Even Alexander VI was energetic, when it became a question of the conduct of others not in the papal entourage. In spite of his known character the jubilee proclaimed in 1500 by Alexander VI was a great success. Twenty thousand people knelt in front of S. Peter's to receive his

blessing. Julius II heard his daily Mass, published his acts against simony, established bishoprics in America, executed four Dominicans who had been imposing on the people with false miracles, and forbade the friars preachers, who frequented universities, to live in houses other than of their own order.

Finally, it may be questioned whether, humanly speaking, the popes could have withstood the reforming Lutheran movement unless they had previously acquired a political status. In other words to have done otherwise than they did, would have been hopeless from a worldly point of view. But in this plea of justification lies the greatest crime of these popes, namely that they took the worldly point of view and forgot the awful promises that the Church claimed to have received from Christ. But while the aim that these popes held consciously before themselves, might be in some sort justified by political circumstances, the methods by which they attempted to realise this aim must be almost wholly condemned. First among these methods may be selected the practice of what has been called nepotism. It has been argued indeed by Gregorovius and other non-Catholic historians that the reason why the popes chose their own relations as the lieutenants of their designs, was that these were the only men whom they could trust. But this is a less convincing justification to a Catholic for, first of all, grave scandal was caused by this practice. Ferrante, King of Naples, described Alexander VI as caring "for nothing else than to aggrandise his children by fair means or by foul." Thus portions of Church lands were handed over to these unscrupulous relations who sought to establish thereby hereditary princedoms for themselves. No "necessity" could ever have imposed this on the Holy See, for the reason that Gregorovius urges is a hardly adequate excuse. Far more harm was done by the scandalous lives of these luxurious princelings than any possible treachery on the part of normal officials.

Again, an obvious result was that these cardinals and nobles soon over-awed even the popes themselves. It was Girolamo Riario, and not Sixtus IV, who dictated the policy of the Roman Curia. It was Cesare Borgia, and not Alexander VI, who stirred up wars against the Italian States. But perhaps what shows more

clearly still the emptiness of the defence, based on mere political arguments, is the fact that *Julius II* succeeded without nepotism at all. He achieved what Sixtus and Innocent and Alexander had striven for, and he achieved it without the means that they had employed.

A second means that these popes had used to further their ends was the sale of offices. The blame of this lies chiefly at the door of Innocent VIII. Ranke indeed observes that this was "the first systematic attempt to develop the modern system of a public or national debt." But his is hardly a sufficient ground of praise. New offices were created solely that money might be made through their sale. The papal secretaries were increased to twenty-six, and each official had to pay 62,400 ducates for his post. Again *plumbatores* were created whose duty it was to affix leaden seals to the papal bulls. These numbered some fifty-two, and 2,500 ducats was the price of their appointment.

Thirdly, the lack of moral principle of these officials, as sometimes also of the popes themselves, though hardly to be classed either as a papal aim or a papal method, was a necessary result of the whole system. It is seen in the extraordinary treatment of Djem (the Moslem prince and pretender) by Innocent VIII, and perhaps in his final transfer to King Charles of Naples by Alexander VI.

The whole of society was rotten to the very core. Only a few years before Pius II could write "Most of the princes of Italy at the present day are born out of wedlock"; and when he reached Mantua for the Congress which he had devised, he was met by some twenty princes, no one of whom was of legitimate birth. When private morals were so low, public morals must necessarily have been of the worst. But out of it all rises the really great figure of Julius II (1503-1513), as bold in politics as was Michael Angelo in art or Bramante in architecture. He was a real patriot with his incessant cry "Out with the barbarians," and yet while he won the the papal States, his purely Italian policy lost to the Church the northern nations.

When Charles VIII of France made his memorable expedition into Italy, which gave to the Italian recovery its fulness and its

dissolution, he reached Rome to find Alexander VI, like the popes of an earlier day, in refuge within the Castle of Sant Angelo. When the King left to return to France, the Pope made an effort to establish his son, Cesare Borgia, as a prince in the Romagna; the death of Alexander and the illness of Cesare at the moment of his father's death (both, it was thought, the result of poison) prevented this prince from maintaining any permanent occupation of the papal territories. Pius III (September to October 1503) succeeded to Alexander to die very soon and make way for Julius II, great statesman and patriot and soldier, but not a great priest. His main preoccupation was the expulsion of the foreigner from Italy and his sovereignty, wherever it was effective, was strong and well ordered. His immediate successors were Leo X (1513-1521), a Medici, whose weak character and small interest in spiritual things allowed the Council of the Lateran, convoked by Julius II in 1512 and opened that year, to dissolve without doing anything to reform the Church; Adrian VI (1521-1526), a Fleming, tutor of Charles V and his subject, whose admirable private life was not sufficiently supported by active efforts at correcting the abuses of others to produce its hoped for effort, and Clement VII (1526-1534), another Medici, whose fatal diplomacy and equally fatal obstinacy precipitated the break of the English King with the Apostolic See.

We have marked this period as the recovery of Italy, and the reason for this is evident. Europe had been broken up into nations; the empire was a name and a legend, it held no supremacy over the rest of Christendom; politically France seemed dominant but gradually surrendered to Spain; the reappearance of England in Continental politics was noticeable only at the end of the period; it saw also the emergence of Spain. But the force of the ideas that impelled these successive policies and that bred the culture of the time, came from the vivid life, recovered from the classics in Italy and overflowed from it over the other nations of the West.

ITALIAN ART

**Dante* (1265-1321), the pupil in Paris of Siger of Brabant, brought into Italy the culture of the earlier Middle Ages, written not merely in the language of philosophy but of the heart. Earlier he had learnt from an Italian, Brunetto Latini, the art and sciences of his time: to these he now added a knowledge of the classics. Indeed in the *Divine Comedy* his guide into the land of shadows and of flames was none other than a pagan, Virgil, the mature and golden genius of the Latin tongue.

Dante was succeeded as master singer by *Petrarch* (1304-1374); this was not a learned age, for Petrarch could not read Greek; but it was an age that desired learning, for on his table lay the closed book of Homer as though it were a mystic talisman, the very presence of which would inspire his dreams. His verses to Laura (whom he saw in a Church at Avignon), his insistence on the need of Church reform, and his pursuit of manuscripts made him the leader of Christian culture of his time. But his successor was not a single man but a city, Florence with her chroniclers like Villani (d. 1349), her story-tellers like Boccaccio (d. 1375), her artists like Giotto 1266-1336 (and his rivals in Siena, Duccio and his fellows), her architects like Brunelleschi (1377-1446), her sculptors like Donatello (1386-1466), and her metal workers like Ghiberti (1378-1455)—whose gates for the doors of the Baptistry in Florence, cast in 1402, are often spoken of as the first work of the Renaissance.

The vast difference that Italy now made in Europe can be seen by contrasting the Duomo of Florence with the Sainte Chapelle of Paris, or the *Orlando Furioso* of Aristo (1516) with the *Chanson de Roland*, which both sing the epic story of Roland and Charlemagne's war with the infidel—but Aristo's with a richness and an intricacy of interwoven detail that the earlier writer was too simple, too austere, and too direct to have achieved or even sought to achieve.

When we stop to ask why Italy was thus the centre of a new movement which altered all the ideas of the time, we can answer:

(i) She had never accepted the Gothic tradition in art nor

*The best short Study in English is Gardner's *Dante*.

the Aristotelian tradition in philosophy. (S. Thomas Aquinas was too mixed in blood to be a mere Italian, and too travelled a philosopher to have settled to the ways of any local university.)

(ii) She had before her eyes always everlasting memorials of the past, fragments of stone and marble, the folk memory of her people, the ancient and undying traditions of the older domination of Rome.

(iii) She had become more and more a centre for the Greeks who, menaced by the Turk, were escaping in growing bands to Italy and finding rich patrons there. These Greeks were the masters of Giotto and of the new Western arts.

(iv) She was stirred by nationalism, but for her alone this was no new thing but the recovery of a venerable tradition. Both Rienzi and Savonarola looked backwards to history for their inspirations.

(v) Yet for many centuries she had no other gift to confer and no other comfort for herself than the appreciation of beauty, for she was divided, invaded, and oppressed.

THE ITALIAN STATES

Beside the papal states, the four great states of Milan and Venice in the North, Florence in the centre, and Naples in the South must be reckoned as other centres whence Italian influence was also diffused to the world. Besides these there were several independent lordships and cities whose possession was often a cause of quarrel between larger rivals, but who thereby at least escaped complete absorption. Each greater Power was too jealous of its neighbour to allow it to extend its territory over them and too much afraid of its neighbour to venture to do so itself, except in a moment of crisis when its neighbour was already too occupied to be in a condition to prevent interference. Thus the Gonzagas held Mantua, fertile and of military importance, till the Treaty of Utrecht, because their territory lay within easy reach of Milan, Venice, Florence and Rome. Again there were the marquisates of Monferrat, Saluzzo and Ferrara, the lordships of Faenza, Ravenna, Forlì, Rimini and Urbino, and the cities of Lucca, Ancona, etc., and the island of Piombino.

Already the old distinction between Guelph and Ghibelline had lost whatever meaning it once had, the Guelphs looking to the Papacy and France and in favour of municipal liberty, while the Ghibellines looked to the Empire and the House of Aragon, and favoured the feudal nobility, supposedly Teutonic in origin. But the facts of Italian politics never had fitted in with the theory, for Genoa, Pisa, and Siena had always been Ghibelline, and some of the feudal princes like the Orsini had always been Guelph; but the last half of the fifteenth century gave this much reality to the division that the foreign invasions found the Guelphic partisans usually French and the Ghibelline partisans anti-French (whether German or Spanish), and in the territories between Venice and Milan the gentry were monarchical and Milanese in sympathy, while the towns and peasantry favoured the republic of Venice.

In Italy itself the other Powers of the north feared the energy and conquest of the Visconti; the great rulers of that house pushed East and West, and, as we have seen, began at one time to strangle Florence. On one such occasion the Florentine ambassador appealed to Venice for aid: "The Genoese, because we deserted them, made him lord; we, if you desert us, will make him a king; you, if you fail, will make him an emperor." Certainly the Visconti, alone of Italian rulers, could have unified Italy as France, England and Spain were unified; but the opposing action of Venice perhaps most prevented this.

Then when the Visconti had been checked, Florence began to fear the Venetians even more. But no other greatness than that of Milan did at any time threaten to overwhelm the whole of the north of Italy. Its power was built in large measure on finance. A network of organised taxation was carefully spread over the territory of the Milanese, itself rich in very great material resources. Her princes—

(i) Developed scientific farming and irrigation so successfully that one good season was said to have enabled the Duchy to recover from the devastation of a war.

(ii) Protected the trade route from Venice to Genoa which passed through the territory of the dukes going northwards by

the St. Gothard, Simplon and S. Bernard passes, and west by Mt. Cenis to the fairs of Lyons.

(iii) Encouraged the skilled steel workers until they had made the city the chief manufactory of arms in Europe, while the circle of towns round Milan were busy in manufacturing cloth, fustian, and felt; Milan had even a large export trade to Venice.

Communes, when he visited Milan, judged it to be rich but overtaxed; but that was because the Visconti were extravagant in their expenditure and cruel in their methods of extortion. Sforza, whose power was more "parliamentary" than was naturally the power of the Visconti, had been less in a position to risk unpopularity through extortion, and was therefore less autocratic in his organisation and more sparing in his demands. He agreed with the city upon certain conditions of government. No new duties were to be raised, for instance, without the consent of the Senate, the taxes were reduced on wine and bread, and the price of salt (a government monopoly) was to be fixed.

Alliances in Italy between all these powers shifted a great deal in the last century before the advent of the Spaniard, but the most stable arrangement was of Milan, Florence, and Naples against Venice and the papal States; the government of Sforza was based chiefly on this principle, with interludes of variation, due to the dread which Florence might have of Milan or the claim on the Milanese dukedom made by the house of Naples. At a moment when this triple alliance was apparently strongly established, a series of assassinations and revolts threw the city of Milan into the hands of a boy, Gian Galeazzo Sforza, under the Regency of his uncle Ludovico il Moro, the eldest surviving son of old Francesco Sforza. Gian was married to his first cousin Isabella, who was on her father's side grand-daughter of King Ferrante of Naples; but Ludovico, who wanted to reign as well as rule, was determined to get rid of his nephew as soon as possible, and began by supplanting him in public magnificence. Ludovico's wife, Beatrice d'Este, outshone in clothes and beauty her niece, Isabella the Duchess; the jealousy which this occasioned was carried to the court of Naples by Isabella's supporters and seemed to have

furnished her father with a cause for great indignation. But it was not only a contest for clothes and magnificence; in 1490 the Duchess had a son born to her; in 1493 Beatrice had a son too. From that moment Ludovico seems to have begun to think of supplanting his nephew absolutely. To remove the nephew would not now make Ludovico heir. Moreover, though the Duke himself was fond of his uncle, kindly, competent, a lover of the arts (it was Ludovico who brought Leonardo da Vinci from Florence), the nobles resented (as much as Isabella did) the dominance of Beatrice and of Ludovico in place of the anæmic and more easily managed duke. These discontented nobles and the indignation of Naples made Ludovico realise that he would soon need to look for help. Naturally he turned to France, knowing how Charles VIII considered himself a claimant for the Neapolitan kingdom, and, though he cared little enough to substitute a Frenchman for the house of Aragon he was willing to make the exchange since he needed a thorough embroiling of Naples and the Holy See, if he were to carry out his designs against young Gian Galeazzo and his Neapolitan bride.

Meanwhile, Ludovico applied to the Emperor for the investiture of himself and his heirs in the Duchy of Milan, and secured it by bribing Maximilian with the hand of his niece Bianca Sforza and 400,000 ducats, though the news of the appointment was to be kept a secret for the moment. Thus Ludovico seemed secure enough, defended equally by the hands of France and the empire.

He invited the King of France to come through Milan to Naples, and opportunely, as the French passed through the city, the young Duke died; at once the imperial investiture was made public. Naples was too occupied with France's threatened invasion to do more than remonstrate; so that all seemed well with Ludovico's plans. He is credited with having called Maximilian his "condottière," and Charles VIII his "courier" (for he had called him to Italy and sent him back), and Venice his "chamberlain and paymaster," and Alexander VI his "chaplain." But all was well only while Charles lived, who had no love for the Orleanist princes, for these claimed Milan as Visconti heirs. At Charles's death, Louis of Orleans succeeded to the French

throne and, putting Naples aside for the moment, aimed at the nearer thing, and made Milan his immediate object. No ally came to Ludovico's aid. Maximilian at war with the Swiss could not help him, much as he would have wished to defeat the aims of France. Incidentally this war of Maximilian's also prevented Ludovico from hiring Swiss or German mercenaries, for these were busily engaged on their own account. The Pope and Florence both needed French aid in their respective difficulties. Naples was unable to help, even if it had wanted to. Venice saw, in the weakness of Milan, her chance to recover Cremona, one of her long ambitions. As soon, therefore, as Louis XII crossed the Alps, Ludovico's power crumbled; he fled over the Tyrol, reconciled Maximilian and the Swiss, levied a mercenary force from both, and came back, rapturously welcomed by Milan, which found in the capable fiscal rule of its native princes more comfort than in the wasteful taxation of France. But the Swiss betrayed him to Louis XII and he was taken off to a French prison, while the nephew's son he had displaced in Milan also came to France, but as a priest. Eventually, though Louis XII secured from the Emperor his own investiture as Duke of Milan, the French were driven out of Italy, and the sons of Ludovico succeeded one after the other, only to die out without heirs and leave the title to be disputed for, and finally secured, by the Spanish crown.

But *the inglorious end of Milan* as a free city, which had so often held the fates of Italy against pope and emperor, was justified, seeing that through its last independent ruler it had brought France into Italy and begun that enslavement of Italy to the foreigner, which Julius II hoped to end, and was achieved only after nearly 400 years.

It is possible to tabulate the turning of the foreigner to Italy thus:

GENERAL CAUSES:

(i) France compelled by her spirit of nationality. She was never happy unless rending her own or others' vitals.

(ii) Italy was distracted by the break-up of the triple alliance which had given her peace, by the new social and moral

upheaval of the Renaissance, and by the tyrannies of the condottieri.

(iii) Europe elsewhere consisted now of nations unified and governed by strong monarchies which had curbed the powers of the barons and Church. These monarchies, who surrounded her, found in Italy their prey.

PARTICULAR CAUSES:

(i) French dynastic claims on Naples and Milan.

(ii) The French were invited by Ludovico and by Venice.

RESULTS:

(i) Rivalry between France and Spain—

(a) To control western Mediterranean.

(b) To control Italy.

(c) To control the Pope.

(ii) Effacement of Italy:

(a) Disappearance of Milan and Naples as Italian states, falling under foreign sovereigns.

(b) Florence became first French and then Spanish.

(c) Venice collapsed as a centre of commerce through the diverting of the trade routes, due to the fall of Constantinople.

(iii) The military dominance of Europe shifted to Spain because her artillery, foot-soldiers and armour were the best, so that the tyrannies of the condottieri ceased to be of any importance.

(iv) Contact of Europe with Italy made Italy the fashion (cf. Shakespeare's scorn of the "italianate" style which dominated the Elizabethians).

The collapse of Venice can also be set out in tabular form, for it was due to—

(i) Her defeat on land ending in the Treaty of Cambrai which deprived her of her possessions on the mainland.

(ii) The monarchical states were concentrated to a strength beyond her competition.

(iii) The financial drain of an expensive war, coming after her single-handed efforts against the Turk.

(iv) The changed trade-routes which ruined her import-

ance; the Turk cut off the Levant, the Tartars blocked the Russian markets, the Portuguese discovered the route to India, and the Spaniards opened up America.

Note the three great trade routes had been—

- (i) From central Asia to Black Sea and Mediterranean.
- (ii) By Persian Gulf and Euphrates Valley to Levant.
- (iii) To Cairo and Alexandria from the Red Sea.

Thence commerce had been carried by Venetian galleys to Venice, and thence over the Brenner Pass by the Inn, the Danube, and the Rhine to Bruges, or round by sea in the "Flanders Galleys" to the Netherlands, England and the North.

No doubt the continuance of Venice at all was due to her political sagacity of government, which Commynes described as almost legendary in its wonder: "To-day I believe their affairs are more wisely counselled than those of any prince in whatever other nation there be in the world."

The only Italian who gained by the foreign invasions was the Pope; while Venice lost steadily in her wealth and empire, while Milan fell to France and then, with Naples, to Spain, and while Florence from a Medicean republic turned into a grand-dukedom, the Papacy became a strong central power, building up its solid block of territory—alone independent, free—and, though threatened even by Charles V and sacked by him, yet survived this destruction as a small but compact temporal sovereignty, alone of all the powers of Italy under no foreign rule.

Even *Florence*, that had seemed so strongly established, fell from her magnificence. Venice was a sharp contrast, stable, secret, without factions, an aristocracy of merchant princes, the trading city of the world; Florence lacked stability, had its open democracy, never free from dispute (Dante's simile of her was "a restless woman tossing on her bed with pain"), a manufacturing centre, with a keen artisan class and high protective tariffs, also a banking city financing for instance the kingdom of Naples. Her great dividing date that showed her splendour but revealed her enslavement was 1434, when Eugenius IV arrived in Florence after being expelled from Rome, and when Cosimo de Medici returned to the city and to power, "carried back to his country

on the shoulders of all Italy." From that date the whole machinery of her government was manipulated to serve Cosimo's purposes, the taxation graded so as to fall with heavier incidence upon his political rivals; and for the old *parte Guelpha* a board of magistrates was set up which presided over all the guilds (even the niche in the façade of the Or San Michele, intended for a statue of S. Louis of Toulouse, the saint of the *Parte Guelpha*, was given in 1459 to this *Magistrato della Mercanzia* to be filled with its patron saint). Cosimo was the master of the secret of successful government; he was loved in his own family, a kindly citizen, utterly relentless in his cruel pursuit of his enemies ("not by daggers like northern princes," said the Chronicler, "but by taxation"), a perfect man of business, a great patron of the arts, and at the end a man of keen religious sentiment. He was the patron of architects like Brunelleschi, of sculptors like Donatello, of artists like Lippo Lippi (Browning's poem shows this truly, as well as showing other things), turning at the last to the noblest characters of his time like Fra Angelico and S. Antonino for his spiritual needs; he was the founder of San Lorenzo, S. Marco, and the Badia, a generous benefactor to libraries, and through Marsilio Ficino the father of the Neo-Platonists. Dying (1464), he bequeathed a fine ordered state to his sick son Piero, whose own daring and manliness increased its power, wealth and strength, and whose more generous character gave far greater freedom than any other Medici ever gave to his political rivals. By his marriage with Clarice Orsini, his sons Lorenzo and Guiliano were accepted everywhere as princes, but were not on that account perfectly secure in their government. Lorenzo, devoted to art and politics, and Guiliano to art and athletics (frequently in Botticelli's pictures idealised as Mars or Hermes), governed Florence (the sons of both were one day to be Popes) till Guiliano was stabbed to death in the Cathedral ("when the priest who sang the Mass was communicating himself," says Guicciardini) and Lorenzo was wounded though he escaped. This half-successful conspiracy was the signal for a general attack on Florence by Rome and Naples, from which the city was only freed by the courageous visit of Lorenzo to the court of Ferrante of Naples,

from which he returned with peace (Botticelli has given the allegory of an olive-decked Medicean Pallas taming the Centaur of war and disorder; Ferrante probably never recognised himself in the uncouth savage, only half a man). By 1490, the constitution of Florence was again narrowed to secure for Lorenzo an undisputed lordship of the city. Henceforth he was treated as an equal by kings and by the Emperor, received ambassadors from the Turk and the Sultan of Egypt, and was the arbiter of Italy (said Guicciardini "No more wonderful or pleasing a tyrant could have been found"; said Macchiavelli "He loved marvellously whatever was excellent in any art"). To the moral leaders of the city, this art of his debauched the city which Dante had once spoken of as "austere and continent," for the new art was naturalistic, exciting to the passions, emotional, and only dealing with religious subjects because the churches were still better galleries than the palaces for displaying pictures to the best advantage.

Does the external beauty of the arts produce eventually in a generation that cultivates it beautiful manhood? Lorenzo, ugly and harsh, was followed by Piero, handsome, affable and ineffective (1490). The chance of the moral leaders came under the inspiration of Savonarola, artist and preacher, lover of the beautiful as became a born-subject of the d'Este in Ferrara, a great Florentine, but loving rather the earlier ways of the more primitive painters. It was his enthusiasm for these and his hostility to the over-ripe renaissance, that made his follower Botticelli plaintive, and overcast his radiance, and turned Michael Angelo from being a worshipper of the old gods into a follower of the Prophets. Savonarola (a Dominican since 1474), whose preaching first began to attract attention in 1490, went to meet Charles VIII when he came marching down from Milan to Naples in order to turn him from the city, through calling him a new Cyrus who had expelled the Medicean tyrants. Poor, deformed Charles proved a sorry Cyrus to the Florentine citizens, trained to a dignity which this King of France could never show. A plot to restore the Medici was discovered; the ring leader and four others were beheaded in the courtyard of the Bargello, while

Savonarola, to whom the families of the condemned appealed, refused to move on their behalf. Then came Savonarola's own excommunication by Alexander VI, which he declared not canonically binding since its validity depended on certain alleged facts which he denied, though he professed always his absolute submission to the Holy See. Florence, however, next year got afraid of the commercial damage of an interdict, and this menace to their pockets turned its citizens against the stern and unyielding friar. The ordeal by fire (an appeal which rescued his opponents from a difficult dilemma) was given no fair testing; on the same day it failed Charles VIII died. An attack followed on S. Marco where Savonarola lived, in the priory built by Cosimo for S. Antonino and decorated by Fra Angelico; Savonarola was taken, tortured, beheaded and burnt: "In our piazza the soul of the great friar went up in flame." That year 1498 is the end of Medieval Italy; in the flames with Girolamo Savonarola, the Middle Ages perished. For generations now French and Spaniard, Swiss and German overran and degraded the home of Western forms of art and life.

Naples, the most southern of the Italian states, came after the death of Alfonso V, who was successor to Joanna under the will of the King, to his illegitimate son Ferrante. At first refused recognition by the Pope, he was afterwards supported by Pius II, who was anxious to quiet all Italy in the hope of leading a united Christendom against the Turk. But the house of Anjou, which at first disputed the claim with him, was soon put out of immediate possession by a succession of victories which left Ferrante in 1464 undisturbed in his royalty till his death in 1494; there were indeed intermittent revolts of his harassed barons, but these ended always in his favour, chiefly because he was always ready to promise amnesties to them and had supreme disregard for any promises of amnesty which he made. After one revolt, he secured the return of the nobles by making them offers of complete forgiveness, and when they did return he imprisoned them without trial or judgment. They were never seen again. When the old King died, as his chroniclers said, he went to his end, "without candle or cross or communion," so little Christian

had his life seemed. Just when Ferrante was dying, Charles VIII of France was preparing for his invasion of Italy in order to secure the throne of Naples; and the successive deaths of Alfonso II (Ferrante's son) in 1495 and of Ferrante II (his grand-son) in 1496, removed the whole royal family of Naples within two years of the King's death. This second Ferrante, dying without issue, threw open the succession of the kingdom to a dispute between France and Spain.

THE EMPIRE

The emergence of Spain, which dates a new era in the history alike of Italy and of Europe, was the result in fact of the absorption of the Empire in the hands of the Hapsburgs. The old division of Germany into the four dukedoms—Franconia, Suabia, Saxony, and Bavaria—might easily have hardened into four separate nationalities, had not the revival of the Empire under Charlemagne held them together in a unity that was not even a German kingship, but a more universal and more religious monarchy. Racially more homogeneous than England was, or France, or Spain, the Germanies, through this dream-sovereignty of Christendom, never became politically homogeneous, nor did any one of the four dukedoms ever become so immensely superior to the others in governing sagacity or military valour, as to create for itself the same supremacy as was achieved by the Normans in England or the Franks in France. Indeed the title of Emperor was non-national, it was European and not German. Hence princes of such diverse nationality as Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso of Castile were actually able to get the necessary votes and secure their election to that office. In 1272, Ottocar of Bohemia was a strong candidate for the Empire. On the death of Lewis of Bavaria, the throne was offered to Edward III of England. Pope John XXII had wanted it for Charles IV of France. In the fifteenth century, Podiebrad of Bohemia aimed at it, and Charles the Bold of Burgundy. Later Francis I was a definite candidate for it and so were Henry IV of France, Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, Louis XIV, and Napoleon. Its political weakness was due—

- (i) To the kingship never becoming hereditary.
- (ii) To its premature consolidation under Charlemagne, its extent being greater than could then be properly unified.
- (iii) Its want of a centre.
- (iv) Its total lack of geographical unity.
- (v) The jealousy of the rival princely houses.
- (vi) The lack of a consistent official class in touch at once with the central power and the provinces.
- (vii) The almost continual absence of the emperors.
- (viii) The old German habit of forming leagues.
- (ix) The absence of purely defensive foreign wars, which appear necessary in order to hammer a nation into a strong unity.

The Hapsburgs who succeeded on the death of Sigismund, the last of the house of Luxembourg, were lucky in their marriages, in their lack of genius, and in their tenacity. Originating in the extreme west of Germany, by collecting fiefs and by marriage settlements, they gradually sprawled across to the extreme east, even beyond Germany altogether. They had four chief groups of territory, the Swiss and Suabian group round the family estate on the river Aar, the Slav group round Styria and Carniola, the Italian round Friuli (to which the free city of Trieste gave itself, in order to escape from Venice), and a fourth the Tyrol, which included Carinthia. To these Albert II, by marrying the Luxembourg heiress, added Hungary and Bohemia. By accidental inheritances therefore the Hapsburgs saved Germany from a combined and hostile Slavonic attack, continued the imperial interest in Italy, and acted as a bulwark against France. Albert II (1438-1439), first of the Hapsburgs, thus combined in his person the titles of Austria, Hungary, and Bohemia. They soon separated at the death of his son, Ladislas Postumus, but remained henceforth the unceasing dream of the house. Yet Albert's rule was hardly more than nominal over Hungary and Bohemia. Austria alone he dominated, crushing the Hussites there ruthlessly, but no less ruthlessly reforming the clergy. His first diet in 1438 was of some importance:

- (i) His measures for public peace and putting down private

wars, included the appointment of a tribunal of arbitrators which was a committee of the Imperial court.

(ii) His division of Germany into four circles (later six) of voluntary associations of towns and districts, on the lines of the Spanish *Hermidad*, developed into a system of government police. Since Austria and Bohemia were outside these circles, it followed curiously that Germany was to be ruled from without.

(iii) His ecclesiastical neutrality, neither for Eugenius IV nor for the Council of Basel, made both sides unwilling to quarrel with him.

He was never crowned, and, dying, left his wife with child, a boy who was born after his death; hence the boy was known as *Ladislav Postumus*. There was never any chance therefore of a direct succession to the Empire for his heir. But by his will, he provided for an executive council of regency consisting of representatives of his three states, i.e., three distinct legislatures united by a common executive, such as prevailed in the Austrian empire till its eclipse in 1918. Ignorant himself, he was a patron of learning, the nearest to genius of any of the Hapsburgs, on the whole sincerely religious and moral, but with a fierce hatred of the Jews.

FREDERICK III

The election that followed lay between the families of Hapsburg and Hohenzollern—for the moment the Hapsburg won. Frederick (1440-1493), who was chosen, was of the junior line. He was the grandson of Leopold, who had been killed by the Swiss at Sempach, and the son of Ernest and the nephew of Frederick, whose son, Sigismund, was lord of the Tyrol group of the Hapsburg territories. Sigismund died without children in 1496, and Ladislav Postumus without children in 1457, so that to the son of the newly elected Emperor was ultimately to come by default the whole Hapsburg inheritance. Twenty-four years old when he began to reign, weak in personality and in possessions, Frederick III managed to achieve greater success in his reign than did more talented emperors, chiefly because he outlived

everyone else. Desired because he was weak, ruling in the midst of immense confusion, his long years of uninterrupted sovereignty gave Germany its one need, leisure to settle down; the forces, that had been fiercely active, cooled into new shapes and then grown immobile, fixed the form of Germany.

His foreign policy was necessarily a series of wars:

(i) The struggle with Podiebrad of Bohemia (1444-1471), the leader of the Utraquists (i.e. those who desired that communion should be received under both kinds) against the Catholics, who was governor of Bohemia in 1452, its King in 1458, and who died in 1471. Personally (so thought Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini who knew him intimately) he was indifferent to religion. He had promised to become a Catholic (his sons certainly did become Catholics), and was crowned by Hungarian bishops who gave him a testimonial of orthodoxy. He rested his religious policy on the *Compactata* as a pragmatic sanction or national concordat, accepted by Rome. This policy and his domestic policy as well, unified Bohemia; while in dealing with his mixed race of subjects—Czech, German and Polish—he was careful to be just in his administration to all. Against the Hohenzollern, Podiebrad waged war till he had secured the recognition of his autonomy, and then made peace with them to prevent their destruction by the Wittelsbach of Bavaria. In 1461 he relieved the Emperor from his revolted subjects by marching on Vienna, and in 1463 again saved the Emperor from another revolt of his discontented subjects. He aimed at forming Germany into a strong state, independent of the religious system of Europe, with a court of international arbitration to take the political place occupied in theory by Pope and Emperor. He succeeded only in his efforts at domestic peace; he failed in his larger projects. The Czech kingdom which he had hoped to found, facing Germany and turning westwards, the policy of which would be to organise, secularise, and nationalise the Empire, was ruined at his death by its coming under a Polish prince who was also King of Hungary. Casimir IV was too weak to continue the absolutist system of Podiebrad and surrendered his

power to the oligarchy of nobles whom Podiebrad had temporarily suppressed. This failure of Podiebrad was due in great measure to the opposition of the popes whom Podiebrad had flouted and decried.

(ii) The struggle with Mathias Corvinus (1458-1490). Mathias was a great soldier and diplomatist, eloquent, a hard worker, educated and fostering education by his foundation of the University of Pressburg. After his marriage in 1476 with Beatrice of Naples, he italianised Hungary, introducing the typical renaissance culture by means of copyists (some of his books are still in Constantinople, some in Hungary), painters and sculptors, as became one who was in close relation with the Medici. He was equally typical of the renaissance princes by fostering scientific agriculture, gardening, and wine-growing. He based his monarchy on Roman law and a standing army, undermined the pretensions of the nobles, and beat down their resistance. First a warrior against the Turks, then the opponent of Podiebrad and his heresies, he was later brought into conflict with the Emperor by appointing the expelled Bishop of Gran to the great See of Salzburg, and by his refusal to suppress the feudatories whom Frederick III had found opposing him in Poland. His success was great, conquering Austria (Vienna was Hungarian in 1484), Carinthia, Styria, and Carniola, driving a wedge between Bohemia and Poland by his capture of Silesia, and holding the German borders of Brandenburg and Saxony by his occupation of Lusatia. His death in 1490 without lawful heirs let his kingdom drift to Ladislav of Bohemia; Frederick III also outlived this troublesome opponent, and after endless defeats succeeded after all in obtaining the Hungarian territories for his house. Fortunately for the Emperor, Ladislav was an opponent whom no one could fear; he only knew one word, his enemies said, and that was "certainly." He left no lawful son, and his territories at his death should have reverted to Maximilian, Frederick's son, under a clause of the Peace of Pressburg (1491) by which Maximilian had ended the war between his father and Hungary. But Ladislav of Bohemia was elected by the

Estates to succeed him and Ladislas's son, Louis, was killed with the flower of the Hungarian army at Mohacs in 1526. Mathias had reached his crown by election (1458) on the sudden death of Ladislas Postumus, whose prisoner he was in Prague. His father had been the great John Hunyadi who, with S. John Capistran, the Franciscan, had organised the defence of Belgrade against the Turk and had headed the last sally which stormed and burnt the Turkish camp and put to flight the sultan and his army, leaving 20,000 dead on the field (July 22, 1456). This immense victory, which saved Europe from invasion for a hundred years, gained for Mathias the glory of a religious and patriotic heritage and his subsequent election. He and Podiebrad were the most prominent of the undynastic kings of the fifteenth century in Germany; but they both failed to make that experiment popular. Neither left sons capable of defending their new kingdoms; and, as the Cromwellian experiment was later to prove, an hereditary prince who is incompetent is less of a failure than an elective prince who is incompetent. There are no inefficient rulers so mischievous as inefficient rulers who are elected for life. They rarely last their time.

(iii) The struggle with Charles the Bold, which, however, he was careful to prevent developing into open war. In 1473, when Charles asked for a royal title in exchange for his Burgundian dukedom, Frederick's answer was to disappear till the trouble had passed: in 1474 he was forced to come out into the open to defend an imperial city besieged by a Burgundian army, but he would do no more than relieve his city. He even refused to follow the suggestions of Louis XI of France and divide with him the Burgundian territories. Secretly he encouraged the Swiss to attack Charles the Bold, whereby he recovered some of the old Hapsburg territory, previously lost to the confederation, and in fact reaped a reward for refusing to dismember Burgundy, at the defeat and death of Charles (Nancy, 1476), by marrying his son Maximilian to Mary, the heiress of Burgundy in 1477 and securing that heritage for his son.

(iv) His relations with France consisted chiefly in his

hiring French troops to fight his Swiss opponents (1445), and in the return of Artois and Franche-Comté to Maximilian (1493) as part of the dowry of the heiress of Brittany married by proxy to Maximilian, but actually married to Charles VIII, and also of Alsace (1492), given by Sigismund of the Tyrol to Maximilian.

(v) On his border lands he lost Holstein to King Christian of Denmark (1479), the borderland to Poland (1466), and saw the Hanse towns decline before the rise of the Baltic powers and England.

From a religious point of view the reign of Frederick was remarkable: (a) for a growing antipathy between the Church and the princes (Sigismund of the Tyrol trying to capture the bishopric of Brixen, and quarrelling with Nicholas of Cusa, its bishop, was typical of this); and yet (b) for a revival within the Church; his reign was an age of great Church building, of schemes for better religious education, and for improvement of preaching. Politically the chief incidents of the reign were—

(i) The growth and consolidation of the power of the territorial princes; there were numerous wars between the towns and the princes (due to the broken territories of the princes which were never neat and compact, but had enclaves and exclaves), ending in the great town war of 1449.

(ii) The conflict between the Imperial party and the opposition (i.e. between the Hohenzollerns, Saxons, Baden and Wurtemberg on one side, and on the other Bavaria, the Palatinate, Bohemia, and Burgundy).

A. The will of Albert Achilles Hohenzollern in 1473, known as the *dispositio Achillea*, was typical of the former, or imperialist, party and became their model:

(a) The eldest son to have the whole territory of the Mark.

(b) Only two other ruling families to be allowed, Bayreuth and Anspach.

(c) The territories of each of these to be indivisible.

(d) Younger sons, if no bishoprics were available for them,

were to be paid off in cash and denied any territorial possessions of the family inheritance.

The Hohenzollerns were competent, and possessed military and diplomatic power; they were thorough secularisers, anathematised by the popes though willing to accept doctrine from Rome, and hated by the territorial lords; they were the natural leaders of the princes against the towns and of both against foreigners.

B. The ideals of the opposition were seen at their best in Berthold, Elector of Mainz, whose policy included:

(a) The enforcement of public peace and an end put to private feuds.

(b) The establishment of a federal court of justice, free from the absolute control of the Emperor.

(c) An extension of the system of administrative circles.

(d) The establishment of an effective Central Council to control administration and check the Emperor.

These ideals though appearing democratic were really aristocratic; for what was proposed was a confederation of princes, as against the federal union of all the several units of the Empire under the Emperor. For the Hohenzollerns, on the other hand, the Empire was to be defended even against the princes. At the end of the war with the towns, when the arbitration committee of Albert and Nürnberg met, it was insisted upon by Albert, that none but princes should sit on it, that there should be no assessors from the towns, and no emperor's clerks, and that the three bishops should sit below the throne-princes. And when the Emperor during a discussion called for one of his councillors for advice, Albert hustled him out of the room, saying that he would allow no one in who was not a prince.

(iii) The formation of the Swabian League (1487), with this ultimate advantage to the Hapsburgs, that it no longer opposed its prince, but rallied to him in fear of the greater absolutism of the Bavarian prince.

(iv) War between Brandenburg and Saxony which ended in a cross-remainder alliance (including Hesse), more or less

permanent, proving of importance at the Peace of Augsburg in 1556.

(v) In Saxony the so-called Brothers' War (1436-1451), between two lines of the Wettins, in which the nobles opposed the bishops and the towns, and which ended in the ultimate partition of Saxony.

(vi) The union of the Hohenzollern possessions under Albert Achilles, and an ultimate division between lines of Brandenburg and Franconia.

(vii) The union of three lines of Bavaria, through Albert IV who married Cunegunde, the daughter of Frederick III.

(viii) The conquest of the Palatinate by Frederick the Victorious (also called Fritz the Wicked), a great renaissance prince, and a magnificent builder (especially in Heidelberg); he kept a standing army of 2,000 horse. He died in 1476.

In the constitutional and social affairs of the reign these are chiefly to be noted:

(i) Attempts were made to reform the Empire, to improve the legislature, judicature and executive, and to create a national army and a system of national taxation.

(ii) The discontent of unrepresented and impoverished classes (knights and peasants) tended to drive them to form leagues. These led to the peasant revolt of 1525.

(iii) The decline of smaller towns into country market towns, and the rise of larger towns into great commercial centres.

(iv) The growth of great commercial syndicates, especially the Fuggers of Augsburg.

(v) A German renaissance, which showed itself in a great intellectual advance, growing feeling of German nationality as far as culture and language were concerned, and the beginning of the golden age of German art.

In all this, the personal action of Frederick III, and occasionally his lack of action, had considerable influence. He was the great dynastic gambler, but he staked his wealth, not on an immediate, but on ultimate possessions. He knew what he wanted

and did not care how he got it; a diplomatist rather than a statesman, realising the prospective value of claims which he never abandoned, and into the possession of some of which his successors were later to enter. He knew neither gratitude nor dislike, intent only on his purpose; a bad general but a hard-working administrator, sober, industrious, and frugal; happy in his marriage with Eleanor of Portugal; with innocent and simple tastes, especially astronomy and gardening, and in gardening he characteristically preferred vegetables. His only extravagance was a love of precious stones, his only accomplishment a nice, dry wit.

FRANCE AND BURGUNDY

The very opposite to him in character and in achievement were his two contemporary monarchs in France, the sovereign Duke of Burgundy, and the English kings who lived during his long reign.

In France, *Charles VII* (1422-1461), a strange prince to have been the fellow-labourer of St. Joan of Arc and to have reaped the benefit of her success, continued his gradual reconquest of France after the capture of Paris in 1436. He is known in French history as the "well-served," and this title was his, not by virtue of a saint like Joan or a sinner like Agnes Sorel, but of his ministers: Dunois, the Bastard of Orleans who disciplined his troops, Gaspard and Jean Bureau who gave French artillery a predominance in Europe that was only displaced by the later greatness of Spain, and Jacques Cœur, banker, financier and merchant, whose loans enabled Charles to carry on his wars and whose discerning and persistent patronage of Marseilles, lifted it, within his lifetime, to an equality with the greatest European ports of Barcelona, Genoa, and Venice.

Similarly, by the Ordinance sur la Gendarmerie, published in 1439, a considerable reorganisation of the country was effected with the purpose of healing the troubled kingdom after its hundred years of war and the insane selfishness of its nobility.

(i) No one was to raise a company of soldiers without royal licence.

(ii) The captains of companies were to be nominated by

the King who was also to specify the number of men and arms allowed to each company.

(iii) The troops to come under the civil jurisdiction of the royal judges and to be denied the right of pillage.

(iv) The payment of the troops to be by the King out of a national tax levied by the King and not raised by the nobles.

The effect of the ordinance was to limit considerably the powers of the nobility; indeed, this was its exact purpose. It took away from them their accustomed privileges:

(a) Of taxing their own domain.

(b) Of maintaining their own troops.

(c) Of indulging in private wars.

Its result was at once to rouse them to violent opposition (as similar ordinances in England and Germany provoked the same rebellions); a considerable number of the leading nobles (except the Duke of Burgundy), assisted even both by Dunois and La Tremouille, the fellows of S. Joan, and by Louis the Dauphin, rose in revolt. But Charles was determined to quell them and was eagerly supported by the peasantry and by the towns; he had little difficulty in breaking up the confederation, and was sufficiently confident of the permanency of his triumph to be reconciled to his beaten enemies. But to strengthen his own arms and to prevent any recurrence of revolt, he proceeded in 1445 to create an army on the lines which the *Ordinance sur la Gendarmerie* had made possible.

(i) He began with fifteen companies each under a captain of his choice.

(ii) Each company consisted of one hundred lances.

(iii) Each lance consisted of:

(a) A mounted knight.

(b) A man-at-arms.

(c) Three archers.

(d) A soldier armed with a dagger.

so that the army amounted to fifteen companies of six hundred men; of these nine thousand men were cavalry.

In 1448, he added to these the *free archers*, on the model of the Scottish archers, whom he had re-organised in 1445, and who

were each to be supported by a parish during peace time, but to receive royal payment during war.

Further, he completed his army under the direction of the Bureau brothers by providing it with artillery corps and corps of engineers.

The effect was immediately seen in the vigorous and successful prosecution of the war against the English—though here he was helped by the weakness of his opponents after the outbreak of the Wars of the Roses, and the inability of the English to take interest in, or to find leaders for, the expeditions needed to defend the dwindling dominions over sea. By 1451 Calais and its neighbouring forts alone remained of the conquests of Henry V, even though cities like Bordeaux still preferred the English rule to the French, and were willing enough to encourage and support English efforts at their recapture. But the position was unnatural; and there was no driving power in England left to feed continually the foreign garrisons with new troops and new ammunitions. Also by now the French army was better equipped and a finer fighting machine. In 1453 the last of the revolting cities surrendered and, except for Calais, Charles had re-possessioned the whole western and southern sea-board of France.

His last disappointment seemed the most grievous; his quarrels with the Dauphin. The young prince, who was as little grateful by nature as was his father, affected to be hurt by the discourtesy offered his mother by the King's extravagant expenditure on her rivals; even at the death of Agnes Sorel, the same extravagance continued. But whether the real trouble was due to the suspicious nature of the King or to the obvious craft of the Prince, the effect was to throw Louis into the arms of Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy. Philip was kind, largely out of sheer kindness, for he had relinquished all efforts to antagonise France, had no friendly relations with England and was too much occupied with his own straggling dominions to bother very much over the French kingdom. Louis, however, though grateful for the protection afforded him, was studying very carefully the Burgundian government—its difficulties and its weakness—no doubt with a clear foresight of how he would be able later to make use of this

knowledge, and was watching equally closely the character of Charles the Bold, the heir of Philip, so as to be prepared for the best way of dealing with him when his own time should come. This personal knowledge was, in a moment of extreme difficulty, to give him courage enough to dare imperil his life in Charles's custody, and to enable him by thus presuming on Charles's magnanimity to frustrate Charles's opposition. As the French king remarked grimly when he heard of the reception of the dauphin by Philip, "he is nourishing the fox who will one day devour his chickens." It also seemed as though it were the deliberate policy of Charles VII to have brought this about.

In 1461 King Charles died and *Louis XI* (1461-1483) began his reign; at his coronation Philip presided as the chief of the French vassals; it looked as though the nobles were now to recover the rights which Charles VII had taken from them, and Louis was willing enough to let them think so, until he was sufficiently strong to be able to rob them even more of their independence. It is difficult to be fair to so mean-minded a king as Louis, unless the new political theory, of which Machiavelli is the clearest exponent, is accepted or understood. The old feudal and medieval concept of kingship had gone, along with the feudal conditions that gave it birth. There was no longer any room for a Louis IX in the new world of monarchies that were compact, centralised and military, and in which efficiency, absolutism, and personal royalty were not only the principal features but the avowed ideals. Commynes, the French chronicler, has described in language, which is unprejudiced but unmistakable, the type of man Louis XI was, with his great aims and little means, his secrecy and his impulsive wit, his superstition and his lack of moral feeling, his cunning and his capacity for being deceived, his love of "small men" and yet his complete dislike of the ideals of such a democracy as S. Louis was able and eager to encourage.

The gratitude he owed to Burgundy was at once duly and publicly repaid by appointing the young Charles to the government of Normandy; but, when, as the nobles grew fretful under Louis's interference, Charles seemed likely to join with them in

a conspiracy against him (and would have had a reason for so doing for he had been suddenly deprived of his government of Normandy), Louis took care to distract his rival by intriguing between son and father and by this securing Philip's good favour and the banishment of Charles. But his cleverness was successful only for a while; when it failed, it drove Charles the Bold into the very position from which Louis had hoped to keep him, by making him glad to throw himself into the confederation of the nobles and to offer shelter to any political exile from the French kingdom.

At the same moment, by a series of ill-advised actions, Louis had roused against himself a host of unnecessary enemies; in his eagerness to secure allies in the troubles which he saw brooding, he sold Genoa to Francesco Sforza and so provoked the hostility of John of Calabria, the Angevin pretender to the Milanese dukedom. In England, Warwick and Margaret of Anjou were each placated in turn by him, but to no purpose, for Edward IV, in spite of Warwick's advice, refused to marry the French princess (which was Louis' policy) and married instead Elizabeth Woodville, niece of the Count of S. Pol, the commander of one of the rival Burgundian armies. The League of the Public Weal, the new and high-sounding name for the old *Praguerie* which Louis himself had joined against his father, now came out definitely into armed opposition, with the Dukes of Berri, and Brittany and the heir of Burgundy as the ring-leaders, and with John of Calabria now adding his Italian and Swiss mercenaries to the French rebel troops. Except for Paris, the Dauphin, and Charles of Maine, his uncle, Louis had few supporters. After Rouen had been compelled to surrender to the princes, Louis agreed to peace, and, giving to each of the revolted princes some concession, settled down to plan a piecemeal destruction of his opponents. This was the campaign he was most suited for, and in it he achieved admirable success.

He began with Burgundy and organised revolts both in Liège and Dinant which, though not successful, yet kept Charles busy even after his father's death in 1467. Happily for him, the Dukes of Berri and Brittany next quarrelled between themselves;

Louis hurriedly sided with Brittany and occupied the whole of Normandy with incredible swiftness. He next persuaded the two Dukes to conclude a separate alliance with him without the knowledge of Charles the Bold (in spite of their oaths to Charles not to do this) and promptly communicated to Charles the treachery of his late allies. Finding that even this was of no effect and that Charles had further discovered his intrigues in Liège, he determined to presume on Charles's impulsive magnanimity and journeyed in person to Peronne, putting himself completely into Charles's power. While he was there, a revolt of the Liègois instigated by France took place, but was unhappily timed. It is described luridly, but unhistorically, by Scott in "*Quentin Durward*," in which the Bishop, a vassal of Burgundy and indeed the Vicar in Liège of the Burgundian rule, was said to have been murdered. (In spite of Scott's story the Bishop was not really murdered by the Wild Boar until 1482.) Charles in his fury marched against the city taking Louis with him, and Louis had to watch, without being able to prevent it, the destruction of the city for the crime of doing what he had secretly intrigued that it should do. However, by dexterous lying, he managed to extricate himself from his difficult position without having had to concede very much to Charles, and at the same time being careful to remind him of the duplicity of the Duke of Brittany, and to suggest the breaking of that alliance and thus preventing also its possible resumption.

In 1472 Philip de Commines deserted the court of Charles the Bold to enter the service of Louis XI; he was in advance of public opinion as to which of the two was to be the winning monarch, but then his opportunity of judging between them and of seeing their respective characters, had been considerable. He had watched them both at Peronne. His deliberate change from the Burgundian to the French court marked the very moment when Charles had changed his policy and deserted France as the field for his ambitions, to turn to Germany and the Netherlands as offering him larger scope for the development of his new hopes of sovereignty. Charles even applied to Frederick III for leave to raise his dukedom to a kingdom, not unnaturally since he held such

considerable domains, namely, Flanders, Gelderland, Lorraine, Alsace and the Breisgau, as well as his original possessions of Luxembourg and the two Burgundies. But though Charles brought the crown to Trier which Frederick was to place on his head, the Emperor, who disliked new claims and opposed any new encroachments on imperial greatness, but who had not courage enough to refuse his request, disappeared by night down the Moselle, leaving Charles to wake next morning and find himself alone with his crown and with no one to give it him.

Engaged in his new German and Swiss adventures, Charles was easily at the mercy of Louis's intrigues; it was to Louis as Charles knew, that the formidable coalition was due which now threatened him—the Swiss, Sigismund of the Tyrol, the young Duke of Lorraine, and the Empire. Indeed so closely was France connected with the scheme, that a treaty was publicly known to have been concluded between France and the Swiss by which Louis obtained the right, in October 1474, to levy forces in Switzerland. This right was used later by Charles VIII, Louis XII and succeeding French sovereigns down to the Revolution; and the name Suisse survives, applied to the frayed descendant of these mountain troops, no longer heir of their race, but only of their uniform, who with cocked hat and halberd stamps the pavement of the French churches and rattles his pannier for sous. He owes his present name to the rights granted by this treaty of 1474.

To retaliate against his opponents, Charles the Bold persuaded the now strongly entrenched Edward IV to invade France. The invasion was begun in 1475, and Charles arrived in person but without forces to welcome his brother-in-law at Calais, a double disappointment to the English king, for Edward needed the troops and disliked the presence of his insolent ally. Louis XI, believing still in his power to hood-wink his opponents and also in the power of gold, bought off the English king and persuaded him to retire home with the complimentary promise to marry the Dauphin to Edward's daughter.

Sore, but yet generally triumphant, Charles saw himself at peace with the world that most mattered, and proceeded to

punish the Swiss who had helped his enemies and harried his territory. But he was a bad tactician, with little opportunity to recover from any mistake he might make in the narrow districts in which his armies had to manœuvre. Defeated at Granson (1476 on March 2) and at Morat (on June 22), Charles saw his enemies triumphant, his allies deserting him, and his subjects in revolt. He turned to rescue Nancy, the capital of revolted Lorraine, and there met not only the forces of the young Duke, but for a third time the forces of the Swiss, and an Italian army, led by the Count of Campobasso, which had been brought on the scene at the expense of Charles, but which deserted under its Neapolitan leader to Duke René as the representative of the house of Anjou. Here Charles in 1477 was a third time defeated and now slain.

Louis at once seized on Flanders, Artois, and Franche-Comté; to counter him, the citizens of Ghent persuaded Mary, the heiress of Burgundy, in 1477, to marry Maximilian, the son of Frederick III. But Frederick would give no money, Louis was determined to fight, the Flemish would oppose the French but would not accept Maximilian, and in the middle of this prolonged haggling, in 1482, Mary died, leaving a boy Philip and a girl Margaret, on whom, and not on Maximilian her husband, now devolved the Flemish rights.

By the *Treaty of Arras* in that year, Louis held his Somme towns and Burgundy, and gained Artois and Franche-Comté; he was to lose them again, and even by his loss to help to build up an empire for the Hapsburgs. But at least the Hapsburgs, when they came to fight against France, were foreigners who could not do more by their attacks than consolidate French national feeling; a successful Burgundy, so nearly French in race, tradition, and culture, might on the other hand have dismembered France and broken it into duchies like the scattered and disunited Germanies.

In 1462 Roussillon and Cerdagne were ceded to Louis at the price of his aid to the King of Aragon.

In 1481, at the death of Charles of Maine, he inherited by a

remainder-treaty the provinces of Anjou, Maine, Bar and Provence.

Louis's daughter Anne was married to the brother and heir of the Duke of Bourbon, Pierre de Beaujeu, with a remainder by treaty to the crown; and his other daughter Jeanne, deformed and unlikely to bring an heir, was forced upon Louis of Orleans, the heir presumptive to the throne.

It was *Anne of Beaujeu*, who ruled as regent when Louis XI died in 1483, leaving Charles VIII (1483-1498) as a child to succeed him; it seemed that Louis's work would all be undone, for a woman regent offered the princes the chances which Louis had denied them. But Anne was capable enough to defeat them by wiles which her father would not have disdained to have invented. On the other hand, the States-General in 1484 seemed also determined to enforce a democratic system on the French monarchy by the claim of the towns to meet regularly and to vote supplies. Anne would have none of their pretensions either, though she encouraged them to consider themselves of importance, in order to play them off against the princes. She it was, so the legend went, who briefed their spokesman to announce the famous sentence that the *Res publica est publica res*, namely that common wealth is wealth in common.

She encouraged Henry of Richmond to attack Richard III so as to keep England out of the dispute, offered Bar to the Duke of Lorraine and suggested that he should begin a law suit to recover Provence. The law suit was easily prolonged for sufficient length of time for the decision of the judges to be given in favour of the crown, only after all danger of the Duke of Lorraine being able to hurt her had passed. The revolting Bretons were then defeated and Louis of Orleans captured. Almost immediately the Duke of Brittany died; but before Anne, the Regent, could interfere, his heiress was married by proxy to Maximilian. Anne of Beaujeu however marched into Brittany, declared the marriage null as the royal approval had not been asked, captured the heiress and married her to Charles VIII in 1488. But the children of this marriage died before their parents; so in the end—at the death of Charles in 1498—Anne became the wife of

his successor, Louis XII. The marriage of Charles and the Breton heiress ended the regency of Anne, until the absence of Charles on his expedition to Italy, left her, and not the Queen, in the seat of authority. But this expedition had to be purchased at a price which was expensive to the French monarchy:

(i) Henry VII was bought off by a heavy bribe in 1492 from his threatened, and probably only pretended armed defence of the reluctant Breton Queen.

(ii) Ferdinand of Aragon in 1493 was given back Roussillon and Cerdagne to restrain him from attacking the kingdom in Charles's absence.

(iii) Maximilian, whose affianced bride was now Charles's wife and had been sent to France, and whose daughter Margaret, pledged as queen, had now been returned to him as no longer wanted, was kept quiet under this double insult by the cession back to him of Artois and Franche-Comté.

With a kingdom thus dismembered, Charles set off for Italy in September 1494. What befell him there we have already told.

IRELAND

Ireland stood outside this general movement of the Renaissance, chiefly because the political and racial disorganisation there gave little opportunity for the development of culture. The bishops were on the whole worldly and often absent; or if present were sometimes little more than military adventurers; the clergy were brutalised by the anarchy under which they had to live, and since the bishops were usually from over sea, and the clergy were native born, the feuds between them were continuous. Even the religious houses were divided into either Anglo-Norman or Keltic, and did not form, as elsewhere, centres of national peace, but of racial difference.

Since Ireland was too poor to be taxed by the Papacy, there was no dissatisfaction with Rome or Avignon, none of the scepticism apparent on the Continent, and no sign of the Renaissance. There were just the glimmerings of university life in Dublin and elsewhere.

NEW FORM OF THE RENAISSANCE

The period of the Renaissance was now to take a completely new form; the medieval renaissance was passing with its definite ideas, its mystic reverence, and its sense of faith. The revival of Italy was to effect the northern nations; as it had affected Chaucer, it was to affect Philip Sidney and Wyatt and the Elizabethans, it was to affect French literature as much as English literature, and had already affected it for many years.

Most of all, the recovery of Italy had been effected in impressing on a civilisation which had become aware of itself as a unity, that this unity seemed worth preserving at a great cost. The persecuting era of the Inquisition* coincided with the recovery of Roman Law and was an inevitable consequence of it. It was the awakening of Christendom to its being the unbroken body of Christ; *corpus mysticum* as the phrase ran, not merely in their books of religion, but in their books on law. It was this that gave them that belief in Rome as their original home (the Rome of the old Cæsars as well as the Rome of the popes) that stamps the theories of Dante with the mark of the ancient classic world. Only out of this close sense of unity, made evident by a common religious faith, a common culture, and an international life in art, language, and design, came gradually the idea of nationality, itself the result of racial differences, geographical isolations, ecclesiastical groupings, and the hammerings of foreign war. The feudal system that united all Christendom, fell apart because the feudatories grew too great, because the greater kings and popes took to centralisation, and because the growth of local language, become exquisite under the new influences, stimulated an emotional attachment to beauty. The baronage, which began as a common institution of Christendom, had now become particular and partisan, because of its local holdings and its organised sovereignty; only an exceptional feudal lord like Warwick, the King-Maker, with domains which were many but scattered, survived into the fifteenth century, ready to betray any king to any other king, since he could still look upon himself, and not on the nation, as the unit. Elsewhere, when the feudatories

*The best book on this is Maycock's *Inquisition*.

had become localised they became loyal; and nations now could consist of lords as well as kings and commons. The lords had by now got into, and under, the national system.

A curious contradiction in medieval political philosophy was (a) an intense love of individualism and (b) an intense love of corporations and guilds. It is difficult to generalise; but it can be safely asserted that the later renaissance suppressed the individuality of the worker, in order to allow larger expression to the individuality of the director of the work. The medieval architect, for example, gave to his workmen a greater chance to develop their own ideas and to work out their own designs than did the architect of the sixteenth century. The gargoyles were the work of men who had watched their village cronies and sat in the village ale-house to see the faces of their folk; the late medieval art became in the end almost entirely submissive to a general purpose and left detail to dull and monotonous repetition. It tended to lose individuality not through any absence or lack of great leaders, but through the thorough suppression of the individualities of the lower craftsmen. It was the same everywhere in art and learning, in religion, in the ways of government, in social life. The tyrant was more tyrannical, the rebel more rebellious, but the little ordinary man suffered the loss of his own self.

At the same time the vivid fondness for the group idea was evident throughout the Middle Ages; the medieval world was built up of guilds and communes. Folk tended to unite in little companies, scholars to form a university, traders a merchant-guild or manufacturers a craft-guild, citizens to buy their corporate existence from the lord, cities to be organised into leagues for commerce or against pirates or to browbeat a prince. The medieval world was permeated by groupings; either huddled in fear, or allied for ambition, or united to pool their accomplishments.

The *knowledge* of the Middle Ages at their close was naturally restricted; it was as wide as perhaps the circumstances allowed to a busy and practical age. It was satisfactory as far as it went, for it was generally sincere. The recovery of Aristotle made it

critical within the limits of its apparatus. Its temper was scientific as far as science then went. Just as Gothic architecture was essentially the display of the skeleton of the building, all the ribs showing, so that the beholder could see exactly how it was put together and where the thrusts came and how they were met, so they laid bare the structure of life and sought to display all the machinery of life. Hence their passion for logic, which is not the pastime of the learned but of those whose wits are quick.

But this view of life has its defects. The worst of logic is that it tends to become casuistical, in the unpleasant sense of that word; and the Middle Ages, built on science, were always in danger of becoming casuistical. Logic-loving Abelard with his questioning of dogmas was succeeded by S. Thomas with his skeleton-Summa of Theology (bare ribbed like a Gothic cathedral); but S. Thomas's works became in the end for his disciples a bundle of texts to be picked to pieces and elaborately commented on for the sake of spinning theories on them, remote from actuality.

No doubt this love of speculation for its own sake was no more than a danger, for there were great figures still in the world of philosophy who held on to reality, and with a noble casuistry developed the moral law to suit the new commercial activities, criticising them and expounding what was lawful and prohibiting what was not.

The weakness of medieval learning was its inexact knowledge; but its psychology was perhaps the most accurate of its experimental sciences, and its moral teaching on social life, on peace and war, and on international relations was perhaps the finest contribution of the medieval world to the ethical development of the deposit of faith.

Of the *crafts* that were now learnt almost anew, the general statement to be made is that they were based on literary suggestion and were not now the expression of a living faith. It is not now so much the doctrine as the narrative of the Bible that is depicted in the new forms of art. The artist was now a narrator; he was hardly concerned in ennobling or being inspired by what he narrated, he was busy telling his tale as literally as he could. Tapestries, carvings, paintings, sculpture, enamel are all rich

with details either of legend or of actual life. The illuminations were now not only of saints or sinners, but of queer little people whom the artist had seen, or were glimpses into contemporary life, the games, trades, occupations, loves and sins of this rich and bustling world. As we turn over the pages of missal or book of hours we find them alive with interest and not so much with devotion; exquisitely coloured birds, or masons and carpenters busy with the building of a frame-timber house, with its wooden ribs already in position and the plaster being filled in between, or the armour makers hammering their chain-armour to the rhythm of music played on a pipe by a minstrel in a corner of the smithy. We find life shown us, visible, tangible, and practical, absorbing the interest and observation of the artist; the world intangible and invisible, has floated off beyond the hills and streams of the landscape and is walled off behind the solid, bunching clouds. The nobility of thirteenth century art and the romance of the fourteenth, have disappeared in the reality of the fifteenth, itself descending almost into the correctness of a convention.

This reality is the large contribution of the full blown Italian spirit, confronted by the newly discovered pagan glories, and a little overawed in its simple aspirations by these ancient and yet already perfect things. The Italian idealism of the primitives was continued indeed in a religious artist like Fra Angelico, whose faith survived the shock of the new learning and the new vision which it gave of the material world. But even in Fra Angelico we find a new naturalism, still touched by the gaiety and glow of faith, and yet freshly caught in the beauty of the visible world. Others, with faith less robust or less delicate, were so overwhelmed by the beauty of what the new learning taught them to see in the world, as to lose any perception of what faith taught them lay behind these visible beauties. So we come on the paintings of Raphael, beautiful and warm and true to nature, but untouched by supernature, not the maiden Mother of God, but any mother of any child. We have realities, but little of their spiritual significance.

We are close to a generation that will only be content with the

letter of the Scriptures, which will believe in the Word of God because it is in print, which will be afraid of anything it cannot understand. Curiously, not only was it Italy that began this and taught it, but it was the popes who patronised it; swept along in the stream of fashion, themselves often of noble culture and education, sensitive and artistic, they did not realise that they were really working towards an end antagonistic to their own principles. Flattered in all they saw, rich and temporal princes, they were yet the sport of the growing materialism, which attracted them by its comforts and at last attacked them for their mystic faith.

Criticism was frequent; on the lips of saints, of scholars, of statesmen, of Churchmen, of the rabble. There had always been a freedom in criticism throughout the medieval time; this freedom was now being curtailed. We can notice prohibitions, suppressions, limitations, the reaction of a government no longer convinced of its power to outlive, out-argue, and win through. Government, civil as well as ecclesiastical, is uncertain, afraid, and therefore treacherous and cruel. It is not quite sure of its power, but it is determined to hold on as long as it can.

Politically, Italy began now to lose steadily its directing place in the whirlpool of the public wars of Europe, for we are embarking on the period of wars in which all Europe was involved. Milan, Venice, Florence, Rome and Naples now count for nothing in themselves, except as the prizes of the strongest power that can dominate them.

Culturally, in art, the science of government, literature, in criticism, in language and song, in general religious sense, in dress, the various princedoms of Italy still directed the world. Machiavelli was the creator of the Absolute State, Leonardo da Vinci and Cellini in different ways the masters of the crafts of Christendom, Valla the leading rebel against the political omnipotence of the Papacy, Mafeo Vegio the father of the new education, S. Antonius the master of the new science of international law.

CHAPTER VII

THE REFORMATION AND ITS REACTIONS

LUTHER

WE now come to that catastrophe in the history of Christian civilisation, which has done more harm than any other to its faith, unity, social life and culture—the Reformation so-called.

The story of the Reformation begins round the story of Martin Luther (1483-1546), Augustinian and the father of the Protestant faith. A scrupulous man, terrified into religion because of his fear of losing his soul, he seems to have lived his Catholic life, as a religious, without finding in it the richness of contentment and peace which it had to give. He was a large, genial, generous personality in outward appearance, fond of the good things of life, and naturally gifted to speak and write strongly and well: direct, practical, and eloquent. His religious life he never really understood, and became oppressed by its additional weight to an already morbid conscience; it was a perpetual cause of irritation to him, fretting him and festering in him. In his priestly training, he had had to learn by heart the epistles of St. Paul; but it seems that one day he was suddenly aware of that side of the Apostle's teaching in which he insists particularly on the merits of the passion of Christ and the salvation achieved in us by grace through these merits. Suddenly, therefore, he realised the divine share, so to call it, in the saving of the soul, and at once, with his impulsive nature, fastened on it as the comfort of conscience, to the exclusion of the need for good works which Our Lord had Himself taught were the necessary expression of our love of God. It is the repeated error of heresy to overinsist on only one half of a truth. To Luther, however, what most mattered was the action of God; he ignored and indeed denied the value

WESTERN EUROPE

DURING REIGN OF CHARLES V. 1525

His Hereditary States
Boundary of the Empire



of the works of the human will: "Man is justified by faith alone"—so this father of Protestantism wrote—"through the merits of Christ being attributed to the sinner."

That is the central doctrine of the reform. Largely, and by exaggeration it can be stated thus: It does not matter what people do; it only matters what they believe about the passion and death of Christ. This he further developed by eventually holding that, not only were human actions not valuable in the sight of God, but they were positively mischievous. The will was in itself evil and all that came from it was evil.

This theory Luther publicly taught and defended at Wittenburg, in 1517, when he was a professor in the university there; in the same year he made his teaching directly controversial by using it to attack a Dominican friar, John Tetzel, who had been commissioned by Albert of Brandenburg, Archbishop of Mainz and Administrator of Magdeburg and Halberstadt to preach throughout his jurisdiction, and solicit funds for the building of S. Peter's in Rome. Tetzel was empowered to grant indulgences to all those who contributed to this good work.

The practice, though liable to abuse, of granting *indulgences* in return for good works, was a common medieval custom. Many of the old bridges, for instance, in Europe were built under such an inspiration. The idea was familiar enough to the people where Luther was lecturing, and probably completely understood by them. What he condemned, however, was the more newly introduced substitution of money for the direct personal labours which, earlier, had been the condition for gaining the indulgence. To introduce money was, in his view, most likely to give an impression to the less educated that indulgences could be bought. Moreover, without directly denying that papal indulgences were of any use, he laid down a series of prepositions which, if accepted, would have undermined the whole basis on which the theory of indulgences rested.

Unhappily, at the time, there was some justification for Luther's fear, for the period was one in which (in some degree through the neglect of the popes) there was wide-spread ignorance among the populace, and infidelity among the leaders of

society, due in part to the decay of scholastic philosophy; abuses were therefore doubly harmful in making the people superstitious and driving the leaders further from the faith. Luther, however, at first at any rate, did not consider that he was holding doctrines hostile to the Church. During the Diet of Augsburg in 1518, at an enquiry presided over by Cardinal Cajetan (who had been Master General of the Dominicans), Luther not only refused to recant, but based his refusal on the ground that he had not contradicted any papal definition. Rome too, influenced by the Elector Frederick of Saxony, Luther's sovereign, was at first friendly to Luther, only imposing silence on both parties, a condition which Luther agreed to accept.

But within a year, driven partly by fear of what would, inevitably (so he judged), happen to him and partly because he found himself being urged to take a new line of policy altogether, Luther broke out into an attack on the whole Catholic position, rejecting (i) the divine institution of the Primacy of Rome, (ii) the infallibility of the General Councils, and (iii) the existence of any religious truths of Christian teaching, except such as were definitely mentioned in the scriptures.

In 1520, the bull *Exurge Domine* condemned some of the propositions defended by Luther, and threatened him with excommunication if he had not submitted within sixty days. This was the opening of the religious war. He declared that he could not submit, as his conscience forbade him to submit; indeed, far from submitting, he joined forces with Ulrich von Hutten in that coarse style of invective against his opponents, which the humanist movement had introduced. Both sides indulged in it, wordy, frank, and full blooded; a war of pamphlets, bulls and condemned propositions ensued. *Celibacy, the sacrifice of the Mass, and the Papacy* were the chief objects of Luther's attack; indeed, they were the three things singled out by the various groups of the reformers, which now followed where Luther had led. But his was the leading pen; his restless and yet genial temper made him a finer leader in revolt than any of the others; but he was not a constructive teacher and had not enough consistency and had too much conscience, to be whole-heartedly all the time what he

might be at any given moment. Hence he was perpetually questioning his own propositions, as much as he questioned those of Rome. His teaching on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist varied all his life; at one time compelled by S. Paul's words to accept the doctrine of the Real Presence, and unable to believe in transubstantiation, he taught that both bread and the body of Christ were present simultaneously in the elements after consecration. Egged on by his followers, and finding himself at a disadvantage in defending such a proposal, which violated both tradition and common-sense, he sensibly was forced into seeing that, betwixt transubstantiation and a presence dependent entirely upon spiritual discernment, there was no middle position. Since the Catholic Church had appropriated transubstantiation, he was driven in the end to accept the purely subjective theory that Christ was only there for those who thought Him present.

Similarly in his teaching on scripture, he was not always happy, for though he wished to limit Christian teaching to what could be found in the scriptures, he was driven to throw out some of the scriptural teaching that offended against his already settled theories.

Finally, he married a Cistercian Nun, Katherine von Bora, in 1525, which necessarily set him definitely against the whole Roman position.

Towards the politics of his time, he showed the same inconsistency; he wrote and spoke in favour of the peasants in Germany, and, when they rose in revolt in the *Peasants War* of 1524, and presented their twelve Articles of peace, he accepted their memorandum but opposed their taking up arms. When it was clear that they could not be prevailed against by any method of persuasion, he characteristically urged, in 1525, that they should be shot down like dogs. They were. His advice to the princes was nearly always followed; but that was a tribute rather to his power of perception than to their docility. He managed nearly always to be in the happy position of urging them to do what he knew they were set on doing. Through this happy faculty of his, his second patron, Philip of Hesse, was able with Luther's approval to marry another wife, while his first wife still lived.

After the religious outbreak had begun, there were many attempts to settle the various disputes that now were included in it: after much discussion at the *Diet of Spires*, in 1526, the states of the empire agreed that, for the present, each state should be left to manage its religious affairs, but that meanwhile each should draw up a scheme of religious belief to be presented at the General Council to be held later.

In 1529 a second Diet of Spires forbade any further alterations to be introduced, but safeguarded what was already in existence. This policy of respecting the existing lines of religious divergence was opposed by the Reforming Princes, who now took the name of Protestants. They would not recognise any rights for Catholics and would agree to no tolerance. Hence in 1530 the Diet of Augsburg was unable to produce any terms of peace; but the *Confession of Augsburg*, drawn up by Melancthon, was intended by that reformer to prepare the way for a general peace. Luther, however, was opposed to any such efforts. His advice ended in the treaty of Schmalkalden (1531) of eight princes and eleven cities, which all conjointly refused to defend Germany from the Turk, who was threatening the West at this moment of its disunion, unless their freedom of propaganda (like the Bolsheviks) through all states within the empire was assured. Under this threat, at the moment, when he was afraid that Christendom might else be over-run by the Moslem Charles V granted this freedom to them at Nürnberg in 1532. After several abortive attempts to draw up a Creed acceptable to both religions, the truce between their political supporters was again prolonged so as to provide some effective defence against the Turk. On the part of the Catholics the Council of Trent was summoned to meet in 1542. The Protestants refused to attend it, and Luther again set himself and them against any compromise or surrender, living just long enough to rewrite his opinions of the situation in more gross language than ever, and to include the Papacy under his list of the devices of the devil. He died of apoplexy in February 1546.

The *war of Schmalkalden* which followed, ended in the crushing defeat of the Protestants. Charles V then made another

effort to draw up a creed that would allow disciplinary arrangements not opposed to Catholic doctrine (marriage of the clergy, communion under both kinds, etc.), but this, known as the *Interim*, again failed to satisfy the Protestants. But when Charles was at war with France and the Turk, the Protestant princes again saw their chance and invaded and ravaged the Catholic provinces; this compelled the assembling of yet another Diet of Augsburg, in 1555, which eventually settled the following points:

(i) Religion was not to be a cause of war.

(ii) Ecclesiastical property was to remain in whosoever hands it then stood.

(iii) The prince of the State, the free-cities, and the nobles who held direct of the King, could choose their own religion; this religion their people were to be obliged to accept.

(iv) Ecclesiastical rulers, who wished to protestantise, were to resign their benefices, which had been endowed by Catholics, before they passed over to the new religion.

Hurt and baffled by his inability to secure a real union of Christendom, Charles V resigned the Empire and ended his days in a monastery near Valladolid in order to pray for the healing of this breach of united Christendom, which he, alone of the princes of his day, saw to be the end of the old order of Europe and the final break-down of the long experiment to hold together by faith the nations of the West. Three years after, 1558, he died.

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

The popes who followed Leo X (1513-1521), namely Adrian VI (1522-1523)—tutor of Charles V, who tried to play his part in the careful religious policy of the Emperor—and Clement VII (1523-1534), were strong and vigorous men. But Clement VII, perhaps of all the popes of the time, was most responsible for the ills of the Reformation. Cynical, and a dexterous politician who used the Papacy to redress any instability in the balance of power in Europe, by swaying from side to side—supporting now Charles V and now Francis I, whichever at the moment was the weaker—he had to suffer the rupture with Henry VIII (1534), and earlier the sack of Rome at the hands of Charles's Constable of Bourbon

(May 1527). Yet in spite of the insults he had received he was compelled to anoint Charles V, in 1530, at Bologna as Emperor of the West, since, after the sack of Rome, any ceremony was impossible in that city. Charles was the last of the Germans to claim at the hands of the Papacy that legendary office. Paul III (1534-1549), in his quarrel with Henry VIII, defended the honour of Bl. John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, before his martyrdom by declaring him a Cardinal; but unfortunately had too much at heart the promotion of his own family to have time or interest enough to establish the Papacy as the leader of the needed spiritual reform. Julius III (1550-1555) got entangled in a war between France and the empire over the Duchy of Parma, so that though he was able to call the Council of Trent for a further session, in 1551, the French prelates (whose king he had antagonised) were forbidden to attend it. *Paul IV* (1555-1559), though elected Pope at the age of seventy-nine, showed himself a vigorous reformer in many ways, but by his bull *Cum ex apostolatus officio* (1559) he roused the opposition of the Catholic sovereigns by declaring all heretical sovereigns deposed, in virtue of his "fulness of power over peoples and kingdoms." This was all very well in the eyes of his followers when applied to the Protestants, but the claim advanced was so general that it made the Catholic princes feel unsafe, for Paul IV was stern and unbending enough to come easily into collision with his Catholic sovereigns, and perfectly capable in a fit of anger of declaring them deposed. For this reason Philip II (1556-1598), as King of Naples, broke from him and attacked him and defeated him. In return Paul IV refused to recognise Philip's uncle, Ferdinand (1556-1564), as Emperor in place of Charles V. His reign ended in unhappiness through the revolts and intrigues of those very relatives of his, whom he had promoted to ecclesiastical and civil posts of dignity. His successor *Pius IV* (1559-1565) was also made bitter by the continued revolts of Pope Paul's protégées, but was strong enough to break them. He concluded the sessions of the Council of Trent, put its decrees into execution, began to carry out its reforms, and published his famous creed. In pursuance of the wishes of the Council, he published a corrected index of pro-

hibited books in 1565. Dying in the next year he was succeeded by *S. Pius V* (1566-1572), a Dominican friar, and the most severe and holy of all the popes of the century. With extraordinary vigour he began to take in hand the whole business bequeathed him by the Council of Trent. Its dates should be noted:

- 1545. The first session was held on the third Sunday of Advent, being almost entirely preparatory. This, however, was followed by sessions in which various decrees were passed against the Protestants, namely in favour of tradition, the need of an authoritative interpretation of scripture, and the solemn authorisation of the Vulgate as the best Latin text of the Bible.
- 1547. The Council adjourned to Bologna, within the papal states; but Charles V, who still hoped to be able to reconcile the Protestants and Catholics, did his best to prevent the Council meeting in papal territory lest this should prejudice his Protestant subjects. No decrees were made while the Council sat at Bologna.
- 1551. The Council moved back to Trent, whence the Spanish bishops had never moved. After some discussion several of the representatives of the Protestants came, but were unable to reach any decisive terms of agreement. Indeed, Prince Maurice of Saxony, one of the Protestant leaders, marched on the Tyrol and under his menace of capturing the bishops and cardinals there assembled, the Council broke up in 1552, but not before it had passed further decrees on the subject of the sacraments, their essential meaning, their necessity and their effects.
- 1562. It met again under Pius IV and settled the definition of three points much in dispute with the new religion—the Mass, Holy Orders and Matrimony. On the point of the origin of the Episcopacy, the Spanish theologians argued in favour of its being divine in origin, and that the bishops therefore had their power from their consecration; the Italians considered it an ecclesiastical order,

deriving its powers from papal ordinance. This point was left unsettled. One medieval practice was abolished in this last part of the Council's activities, namely the pardoner with his scrip of pardons from Rome. Henceforth none less than bishops could grant or dispense indulgences. Part of Luther's original proposition, in which he noticed and declaimed against the abuse of this power by irresponsible persons, was thus in some degree declared to be justified by the Catholic Church. The Council ended in December 1563.

POPE PIUS V

Pope Pius V, whose life work it was to carry out the reforms of the Council of Trent, was well fitted for this post, endowed as he was with a gift for organisation, and, above all, with a power as a spiritual leader, which infected with new vigour and courage whoever came in personal contact with him. Not naturally impulsive, he was utterly fearless, and this combination of caution and intrepid action made him the best pontiff to deal alike with the England, France, and Spain of his time. His first contact with *Elizabeth*, after his election, was to send her a message of sympathy and friendliness, and to the end of his dealings with her, he admired her courage and her virility, and regretted that he had no such sovereign on his side, in the religious and political quarrel which still rent Christendom.

The position was a complicated one for the Pope. He was anxious to restore England to the unity of the faith, and he was convinced that this could only be effected by the return to the faith of the English sovereign. It was recognised abroad as well as at home, that the English people as a whole were favourable to Catholicism, and that they were prevented from siding with it openly, only through their natural docility to government, and the fierce opposition of that government, in the person of *Elizabeth*, to the Catholic cause. The obvious papal policy was, therefore, to aim at the conversion of *Elizabeth*, and this had been the hope of each pontiff who had so far dealt with her. It was also the early hope of S. Pius V. In word and in action he

made overtures to the Queen, since he knew of her dislike of the Protestant extreme party, and of her preference for the general system and teaching of the Faith.

If she would not become a Catholic, what was to be the next aim of his policy? There was always the possibility of her death, and the succession of a Catholic sovereign in the person of Queen Mary of Scotland, the natural heiress to the throne. There was also the possibility of her marriage to a Catholic prince, and the return at least of the chiefs of government to the Catholic faith.

But once the name of *Queen Mary of Scotland* was mentioned, the political forces of Europe, whom Pope Pius had to manage and control, were immediately divided, for the political forces of Europe could not be got together to favour her succession. France and Spain were wrestling for the supremacy of the West, and the whole hearted support of England could make either the victor in their contest. Spain had won in the first encounter when Mary Tudor married Philip II; this put England definitely against France. Its tangible result was the French attack on Calais and its loss to England (1558). At Mary's death, Philip offered to marry Elizabeth. The Queen, without deliberately refusing him, as she was then in no position fully to meet and master the forces of Spain, continued to play with the project of a Spanish match so as to keep Spain from attacking her. But her chief preoccupation for the moment was with France. Her heiress, Mary Queen of Scots, had had a French husband, had been brought up in France, and was, like all the Scotch, French in sympathy both by traditional policy, and by the necessity of preventing themselves being overwhelmed by their stronger neighbour, England. Mary's accession to the English throne would have swung England into the French orbit. That was why Philip of Spain would never lift a finger to help her, in the various efforts made by some of the English political parties to substitute her for Elizabeth. Philip was certainly going to do nothing to help the French to secure the power of England on their side. It was only after Mary Queen of Scots had finished her tragedy in Fotheringhay (1587), that Philip launched the Armada (1588).

Not till then was it safe for him to disturb Elizabeth's solid possession of the throne.

France, however, which had every reason to gain by Elizabeth's deposition and the accession of the Queen of the Scots, was very carefully prevented from doing anything to affect it, by the amorous proposals of Elizabeth, through various channels, to one French prince after another. Without definitely committing herself and without definitely refusing herself, Elizabeth managed to keep the French court expectant of a marriage alliance till it no longer mattered to her what France should do. Indeed, Elizabeth cleverly insinuated that, after all, a marriage between her and a French prince would bring England more easily under the French influence, even than the possession of the throne by Mary of Scotland, who was quite capable of marrying an English noble, and of remembering her subjects north and south of the Tweed and forgetting her French past and the French alliance. James I of England, her son, afterwards was in fact far friendlier to Spain than to France.

While Elizabeth's possession of the throne was a matter of political importance to Spain, and to France a political menace, to Pope Pius V it was much more the centre of a religious problem. He was less concerned with the politics of Europe than with its unity of faith; and it was only after prolonged and careful negotiation, that S. Pius was convinced that the only possibility of success was to deal with the Queen with firmness and decision, and that this firmness required the launching of his *bull of Excommunication* on 25th February, 1571. In this bull, he declared that, by her refusal to carry out her coronation oath, she had forfeited her title to the crown, and that her people were correspondingly free of their oath of obedience to her. This of course meant war between Elizabeth and the Papacy; but it also meant that the Catholics in England would now be in the unhappy position of lying at Elizabeth's mercy, and yet being obliged spiritually to believe her excommunicated. The Spaniards, Philip and the Duke of Alva, represented this to their ministers at the Roman Court and endeavoured to secure the holding up of the publishing of the bull, in the hope of getting it withdrawn.

But though in time the Pope realised that the effect of the bull was not to disturb Elizabeth's authority, but to procure (as Bl. Edmund Campion said) "much severity in England and the heavy hand of her majesty against the Catholics," he refused (even at the request of the Emperor Maximilian) to withdraw it.

The disadvantages of the publication of the bull were:

(i) The loss of prestige to the Pope since the Catholics did not obey it. Subsequently leave was given to Catholics to accept the Queen as lawful sovereign.

(ii) Grievous trouble of conscience to the faithful in England who still—as did Campion for instance—believed her to be "not only Queen but lawful Queen." But this was eased for them by the Canonists who declared it to be good law that the burden of the excommunication fell on the Queen and not on them; she should depose herself, but till then she was to be obeyed.

(iii) The loss of those who held only weakly to the Faith and who were no longer able to compromise between their two loyalties.

Its advantages:

(i) Clear intimation that Elizabeth's religion was unacceptable to Catholicism.

(ii) The first absolute refusal of Catholics now to attend Protestant places of worship.

(iii) The arousing of Catholics from the lethargy which had hung over them in England since the reign of Henry VIII.

As far, therefore as the religious side of Christendom was concerned, the act of Pius V no doubt had great gain, but politically it is not evident that the gain was much. It made the situation more precise. It did not alter it at all.

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION

Meanwhile a new force had come into the hands of the Papacy by the foundation of the *Society of Jesus* by S. Ignatius on 15th August, 1534. First as a crusading order against the Mohame-tans in Palestine, then as an organisation for dealing with the spiritual life of the laity, later as a weapon against Protestantism,

and finally as a band of educational experts intended primarily for poor children, the society came gradually to accept any sort of work commissioned it by the Pope. Of this society S. Ignatius became the first "General" in 1541, and almost his first act was to dispatch S. Francis Xavier on his adventurous career as a foreign missionary. At Trent the Jesuits had been ably represented by Lainez, the successor of S. Ignatius, and though their theologians were not yet of any outstanding merit, nor so numerous as those of other religious orders, they began to exert an influence out of proportion to their numbers or their learning, but not out of proportion to their zeal or enthusiasm.

At this time too, it must be remembered, took place the reform of the Carmelites by *S. Teresa*, the establishment of the *Oratorians* and *Theatines*, the foundation of a growing number of pious societies, congregations, and clerks regular for the development of works of charity and education. The main difference between all these new societies and the older ones, was the now general rejection of the choral recitation of the Divine office and of liturgical forms of prayer. The spiritual exercises of S. Ignatius did a great deal to effect this change, in which meditation on the solemn truths of faith and examination of conscience were developed and substituted for the public choral praise of God. It was a self-concerned spirituality that now began to command the attention of writers and preachers, the soul concerned with its own shortcomings and determined to fight down these imperfections one by one. Even the new mysticism of S. Teresa and S. John of the Cross was generally overwhelmed by the other contemporary type of spirituality, and could only gather a small circle of authorities to be interested in it. But the religious ideas of S. Ignatius, sharp, military, and practical, seem to have inspired the movement of the Counter Reformation which now began to limit and even drive back the advance of the Reform.

THE RISE OF SPAIN

Charles V (1516-1556) had in Spain continued the general policy of the centralisation of the monarchy beyond the dreams even of Ferdinand and Isabella. Unified as the kingdom seemed

to be on the marriage of these two sovereigns (1479), there had been difficulties all through their joint reign (1479-1504). These difficulties had prevented an absolute fusing of the two countries into one.

(i) The foreign policy of Aragon was bitterly anti-French, for the territories that Aragon claimed—Roussillon, Navarre, Genoa, and Naples—she disputed with France; Castile on the other hand had little opportunity for contact with France, hostile or friendly, since she was wholly bent on extirpating the Moors.

(ii) The discoveries of the West were financed by Queen Isabella, Ferdinand and his Kingdom caring little for the adventure and willingly agreeing that all the profits should accrue to Castile: "I will assume the undertaking for my own crown of Castile" had been the Queen's decision.

(iii) In Castile political supremacy lay with the disunited great nobles who were opposed to the armed alliance or *Hermidad* of the towns. Between these two the monarchy in effect was able to hold the determining voice. Aragon however had a united aristocracy, a house of representatives in which from the twelfth century the towns had been represented, and a justiciar whose power of arbitration was considerable. Hence the monarchy in Aragon was of little force, so that when Ferdinand (sole monarch 1504-1516) conquered Navarre (though by that time Isabella was dead, 1504) he incorporated it in Castile and not in his own Aragon, precisely that he might have more power over it than he would have had if it had been united with Aragon.

(iv) The peaceful union of the two kingdoms had even prevented the absorption of one by the other; conquest might have welded them; this political alliance left them only as allies.

In 1519 the revolt of the *Comuneros* furnished the young Charles with an excuse for ruthless tyranny which he eagerly made use of. Sixteen when he succeeded to the united Spanish crowns in 1519, he had behind him not only the energy of youth, but also the stern and cruel political sagacity of the Renaissance.

These *Comuneros* or defenders of the rights of the Communes of Castile, were assisted in their revolt by the French. This brought them unpopularity and made them appear conspirators against their own nation. They were eventually defeated and disenfranchised in favour of the nobility in 1521, who were in turn also themselves disenfranchised in 1538.

Meanwhile in Europe generally, while the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had seen the growth of Parliamentary Reform, the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries watched a growth of centralisation in the hands of the monarchs. In Germany these two processes were simultaneous. We have already described the theories of Berthold of Mainz and his electoral College, which was a belated following of Simon de Montfort and his parliamentary committees. There the elements of government were the Emperor and the Diet. But the Emperor was also a local prince and this brought him into difficulties, when the interests of his house clashed with the interests of the Empire. He was little likely to hurt the interests of his own local principedom, since he got from it, and not from his imperial position, his wealth and revenues, his feudal supporters, and his ecclesiastical patronage. The Diet was, as a whole, feudal rather than national, with insecure representative from the towns and none from the knights. It was composed of:

(i) *The body of Electors*, who had full sovereignty in their own domains, and formed a College in the Diet, with power hardly less than the power of the Emperor himself;

(ii) *The Princes, who were neither electors nor knights*, but who eventually triumphed in a thoroughly disunited Germany by discrediting the Electoral College and securing for themselves immunities—in fact becoming territorial princes, and refusing to allow either Emperor or Pope or their own estates to interfere with their sovereignty. It was these in consequence who made Protestantism possible, who used it for their own ends, who refused to bind themselves to limit their propaganda to their own territories, and who broke down the imperial monarchy of Charles V. Their “reception” of Roman law was based on their belief that it included three points

which Imperial Rome was supposed to have taught the world:

(a) "What the Prince wishes has the authority of law."

(b) "A corporation can only be established by a man" (hence the need of a charter before a town could be acknowledged to be free).

(c) "The peasant is the same as the old slave."

(iii) *The towns* which gathered wealth by being on the great trading routes, either under the hills or on the main rivers, and which, had they not been too jealous and quarrelsome, could, by continuing and developing their system of federations, have ruled the Empire. As it was—

(a) They provided the finance which "ran" the Empire.

(b) They worked out a municipal system which was a model of political sagacity in local government, including bye-laws, officers, and education.

(c) Their culture gave whatever they had of a renaissance to the princes and knights.

With all these quarrelling powers to dissipate the Empire, it was Spain that took over the leadership of Europe; and the power of the Emperor under the pressure of the princes steadily sank. Under *Philip II* (1556-1598), industrious and careful, the new venture of organised and centralised power began. His system of government was personal and individual, but it was supplemented by an elaborate organisation of spying which was not devoted to his own subjects only, but also, through his ambassadors, included foreign nations. It was for the same reason and from the same secretive characteristic of his nature, that he refounded the Inquisition as part of his method of government, relentless, intensive and devoted to detail. Chiefly intended for the Mohammedan converts to Catholicism, in the old Arab kingdoms, who were suspected of wishing to revert to their older and more relaxed way of living, the Inquisition, in its method of dealing with them, goaded them into a revolt which it took four years of war under his half-brother, Don John of Austria (his father's illegitimate son), to suppress. But the Moriscos (as they were called) were finally suppressed and expelled from their old

territories, which by that time were reduced to desolation; their towns and industries destroyed, and the commerce of Valencia and Granada crushed beyond revival. It was this war, perhaps, more than anything else, that impoverished the productive capacity of Spain, and made the immense wealth that flowed in from the newly discovered colonies a wholly deceptive indication of her capacity to lead Europe.

His other military success was his capture of Portugal and his enforced union of it with the crown of Spain.

This was effected after—

(a) The death of King Sebastian of Portugal, in 1578, at the defeat of his troops by the Moors at Alcázar-Kebir.

(b) The death of King Henry of Portugal, in 1580, who had succeeded his nephew, King Sebastian, but being a cardinal had no issue.

(c) The conquest of Portugal that same year, 1580, by the Duke of Alva in virtue of the claim of Philip to the crown of Portugal, as descended from an elder sister of Henry and of Sebastian's father John.

The union of the two crowns only lasted till 1640.

THE NETHERLANDS

The long war in the Netherlands, famous or infamous for the name of the Duke of Alva (1567) and his ruthless dealing with the revolted provinces, was another cause of the weakening of the Spanish domination, because it wasted and finally alienated another chief centre of its commercial prosperity. Charles V, though stern in his dealings with Flanders (when it showed an inclination to accept the Reform and so secure a political alliance with some of the German princes and England), was himself a Fleming by birth, and too proud of his relationship with this people to make himself wholly unpopular and drive it to desperation. But Philip had no such claim to put forward on the sympathies of the people; he was ignorant of their ways, aloof, and narrow. His long absence from the country encouraged them, and gave them every hope of success in demanding fuller liberties than they were allowed under their actual Spanish military

government. This military form of government, which was the cause of all the trouble, was due to the belief which the Spanish rulers had had for a generation, that the Low Countries were Spain's real line of defence. Neither the Germanies, nor England, nor France could dare attack her, said the Spanish military critics, so long as these provinces were hers. Lying as they did, so close to England, France and Germany, their possession by Spain made the neighbouring nations too vulnerable for these to go out of their way to attack, unless they were sure of being able to win. If the Spaniards held the Netherlands as a base, the communications of a force invading Spain from abroad would be cut, and its fleets and armies threatened in the rear; even foreign capitals could be menaced from the Spanish Netherlands.

The citizens and poorer nobles of Flanders were willing to accept some compromise with Philip on the religious question, if he would withdraw his inquisition; but Philip held with fanaticism to his promise to his father to do nothing to weaken Catholicism in the Netherlands, and this request of theirs only made him try the harder to crush the Reform. This led to outbreaks on the part of the Netherlanders; Catholic Churches were set on fire, shrines pillaged, and priests put to death. Philip's reply to this was the Duke of Alva and the *Council of the Troubles* with its ruthless policy of extermination (1567-1573).

The execution of the Counts of Horne and Egremont in 1568 by order of the Council produced the most violent reaction; William of Nassau, Prince of Orange, fled from the country; albeit the cities (aided by England whose trade with Flanders was threatened by the Spanish military government), broke out into insurrection, but were defeated and quelled. A galling tax of one tenth was imposed which roused merchants from their momentary submission; while ships of piracy came over from the English shore to ravage the Spanish commerce; and the Prince of Orange (known now as William the Silent, and a determined Calvinist), returned at the head of German soldiers, and was elected Stadtholder or president of the States of Holland, Zealand, Guelder and Overijssel, and given an elected representative council of these provinces in 1573 to aid him by their advice. By

1576 he was at the head of seventeen provinces; by 1578 he had been defeated by Don John of Austria, the new Governor, but in no wise weakened; by 1579 the ten Catholic provinces of the Flemings were detached from the seven Protestant provinces of the Netherlands; in 1581 the seven Provinces declared their independence; in 1584 William of Orange was murdered and his younger son, Maurice of Nassau, succeeded him, a boy of seventeen. The English protection had been of little assistance to the Dutch Republic, as it called itself after 1581, until the dispersal of the Armada left the Spanish troops to themselves, and allowed Maurice of Nassau his chance to show his brilliance as a soldier, and his ambition as a ruler. Once successful, he became as unpopular amongst the Netherlanders as Philip had been, avenging on Barneveldt, the supreme civil magistrate, the tyranny he could not practise on the people. The Republic retained him as its Commander-in-chief but not its Prince; and continued in the successors of Barneveldt the supreme executive office. The subsequent history of the Provinces was an epic of commercial greatness, but their greatness depended on their holding of the sea. On their loss of sea power to the English, their wealth and influence declined.

DECLINE OF SPAIN AND RISE OF FRANCE

At Philip's death in 1598 Spanish greatness had already passed.

- (i) The exactions required for his expensive foreign policy;
- (ii) The destruction of the Southern trade of Valencia and Granada;
- (iii) The loss of the commerce of the Netherlands;
- (iv) The initiative of the people broken by tyranny; combined to end, in failure and bankruptcy, a reign that seemed to open with such glorious auguries.

Meanwhile France, which had also seemed to promise great things, was under a momentary eclipse.

The early heresies in France, except for Calvinism, had been spasmodic and ineffective. Such unorthodox preachers as there

were, did not pose as followers of the Reform, but only of a Reform, in which criticism, sane but hardy, seemed the only weapon to be used. But it was the militant genius of *John Calvin* which really agitated the public when he proclaimed his *Christian Philosophy* in the University of Paris, using as the trumpet of his proclamation the lips of the dignified Rector of the University, on the feast of All Saints, in the Church of the Mathurins in 1533. The King, Francis I (1515-1547), however, did not bear much ill-will to those who sought reform (though the Rector and his prompter, Calvin, found it safer to leave Paris for Bâle), until denunciations of the Mass were found posted on his very doors at his Castle of Amboise. The royal anger now steadily increased against the preachers till he began a direct attack on them in 1536, the very year that saw Henry VIII's breach with Rome. But the action of the Calvinists in defiling the sacred places of Catholic worship, was responsible for this explosion on Francis's part which the people of the country thoroughly shared.

Francis I, however, in his efforts to conciliate his heretics who were half-rebels, soon turned round again to his earlier toleration; to him, therefore, Calvin dedicated his *Christian Institution*. Within ten years, Francis had again joined the papal policy of repression, to such an extent that the Pope had to remonstrate with him for burning a heretic alive. This had happened after Francis had fallen under the power and influence of Charles V.

Note the wars between Francis and Charles:

1521, which included the capture of Pampeluna, and the conversion of S. Ignatius, and ended in an alliance of England with the Emperor and the isolation of France.

1524, which began with a French invasion of Lombardy, and ended in the defeat and capture of Francis at Pavia the next year, and the treaty of Madrid.

1527, which, in alliance with England, was a French raid on Italy. The French were driven back and forced to the treaty of Cambrai, in 1529, by which Francis I

(i) Renounced his claim on Naples, Milan, Genoa, Flanders and Artois.

- (ii) Retained Burgundy.
 - (iii) Agreed to marry Eleanor of Portugal.
 - (iv) Surrendered Tournay.
- 1536, which was a French attack on Milan and Piedmont, and ended in the Truce of Nice, and the treaty of Toledo, with mutual marriages between the two houses of Bourbon and Hapsburg.
- 1542, which began in a grand alliance of France with Turks, the Duke of Cleves, and Sweden, and ended with the advance of Charles V on Paris and the Peace of Crespy (September 1544). Here Francis surrendered all he had ever won, and renounced all claims on the Hapsburg possessions, while Charles in turn gave up all claim to Burgundy and the Somme towns.

When *Henry II* (1547-1559) succeeded Francis in 1547, the attacks on the Reform increased in violence, and the attacks of the Reform on statues and priests in equal proportion; it is undoubted that the crown was afraid of a repetition in France of that political division of religions in Germany, which had to all intents disrupted the Empire. England was entirely a Protestant political force, Spain entirely Catholic, Germany by its divisions was politically of no force at all; France was determined to avoid being reduced to the feebleness of the Empire, and saw, as the only alternative, the necessity for taking measures to preserve the Catholic unity of the nation. Moreover, when in 1558 two of the Bourbons joined the Reform, Anton King of Navarre and his brother Condé, the Huguenots were already on the way to form a fairly strong party within the state: men like Coligny, Admiral of France, the Bishop of Beauvais (who had renounced his Bishopric, but used his title as Cardinal though he had married), Théodore de Bèze and Arnold Bodin, and (as was always necessary in France), women like Margaret the Queen of Navarre and Jeanne d'Albret, her daughter and heiress.

To see this group forming was enough to frighten the French King, who had a good object-lesson of what might be in store for him as he watched at Geneva, the anti-monarchical movement of Calvin (lately his own subject) now gaining force, seizing the city

in 1541, and governing it along the lines of his doctrine of rigid predestination, hard, autocratic, terrible. These lessons, unnecessary even though they were, were not ill-learned: the three brothers who succeeded each other on the French throne, were afraid of their Protestant Bourbon heirs, and despite the moderating influence of the Medici Queen, ruthlessly, though spasmodically, fought the increase of heresy. The house of Guise, with its strength and persistence, took the leadership from these sickly monarchs, whose physical weakness and exhausting vices, perhaps deliberately provoked and pandered to, prevented them from taking the directing charge of affairs.

Meanwhile, under the patronage of Queen Catherine de Medici, wife of Henry II, mother of Francis II (Mary Queen of Scots' husband, King of France for one year only, 1559-1560), Charles IX (1560-1574), and Henry III (1574-1589), a political party had come into prominence, "the Politicians," who aimed at tolerance for religion, irrespective of politics. That generation was not accustomed (as are the men of our time) to regard Christendom as permanently disunited; they persecuted not out of a spirit of intolerance, but of a spirit that could not accept religion as a matter of political indifference, nor believe that truth or falsehood in religion were unrelated to normal life. But the efforts of the Queen to second this party of the politicians broke down, under the hostilities and massacres of both sides.

FRENCH WARS OF RELIGION

The result was the beginning of the wars of Religion (1562-1570), in which the Huguenots showed the disruptive political effect of their religion by handing over la Rochelle to the English, and thereby seemed to justify the charge of disloyalty which the Guise had made against the Reform in France. Murders and battles were the monotonous items in the war, wherein the Queen found herself driven into the arms of Philip II and his fanatical political dreams. Her old desire to secure tranquility in the kingdom never ceased to push her forward, but both the Huguenots and the Catholics gave her little chance to find an opening for its fulfilment. Coligny, the surviving leader of the

Huguenots, with his desire for a political union of Protestants, in the Netherlands, in the Germanies, in England, was the real centre of the Reform, for his fellow councillors were either too inexperienced to offer advice or too young to accept it. The older Catholic chiefs had also disappeared in the violence of war and assassination, and those who remained were too youthful to have overborne the Queen. Had she been helped by anyone on either side she would have achieved a middle policy. Charles IX began by accepting the policy of Coligny, and declared war on the Spaniards in the Low Countries; but an unexpected obstacle came from over sea. Elizabeth would not agree to the expulsion of Spaniards, for under the circumstances this would have only meant that the French would take their place. She blocked the enterprise, and in consequence Coligny lost favour at the French Court.

Afraid of new proposals that might sweep aside the royal house and substitute for it the Bourbons of the Reform, the Queen engineered the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Eve (August 24, 1572), with its destruction of the Huguenot followers who had come to witness the marriage between Henry of Navarre and the young sister of the King, a "mixed" marriage, celebrated in the open air outside the front of Notre Dame in Paris, because the "heresy" of the future Henry IV would not allow a solemnity within the Cathedral walls.

But the massacre was straightway in 1573 followed by a royal decree permitting Protestantism; in the midst of the confusion caused by this sudden change of front, Charles IX died (1574), and Henry III* (who as Duke of Avignon had been elected King of Poland in 1573) succeeded to the French throne. The first new sign of what was to follow, was the founding of the League; in 1584 the death of the King's brother, and the obvious inability of the King to have children, showed clearly that the throne would soon be occupied by the King of Navarre, a heretic in the eyes of the Catholics, and a political disruptionist in the eyes of the League. Consequently the reign of Henry III was a reign of

*A defence of him has been published by Maurice Wilkinson *A History of the League* (1576-1595)

menace and of actual war, in which the League tried by every manner of means to ward off the inevitable rule of Henry of Navarre. But his geniality (which ran neighbourly with his lack of moral restraint), his administrative power, and his military genius gave his enemies little hope of achieving their purposes. Moreover, the League in its determination to master the situation, began to insist on the subservience of the King to its dictatorship, and whenever Henry III acted independently or against the advice of the Guise, he was denounced as a favourer of heretics and as no King at all. This perhaps made the King act more precipitately than he might otherwise have done, and after the murder of the Duke of Guise in the King's presence and at his summons on 23rd December, 1588, and the threat of papal excommunication, Henry III opened negotiations with Henry of Navarre along lines that the Queen Mother had all along desired: mutual tolerance for religion and the recognition of Navarre as heir to the French throne. With this as a basis, the two Kings began a campaign for the recovery of the royal authority in France. On the day before the assault planned by the kings on Paris, Henry III was murdered by a mad Dominican, dying in the early hours of 2nd August, 1589.

Henry of Navarre now was accepted as lawful King (1589-1610) by most of the French, though he had still to capture his kingdom, aided by an armed force of English under Lord Willoughby. The opposing forces met at Ivry, near Dreux, on March 14th of the next year, and the victory of Henry gave him France, not at once, but inevitably; the Pope now opposed the League, the *Politiques* were growing in strength, Normandy was finally secured when Avranches fell, and the forces of Parma (sent by Spain to aid the League), coupé up between Coudebec and the sea, were shut in at Yvetôt. Though these forces escaped capture by crossing the river overnight on pontoons and boats, the Duke of Parma, who had been wounded in the fighting, died before the year was out, and the military resistance of the League was doomed.

Moreover, the people of France were tired by now of these incessant wars of religion, and desired somehow to achieve a

lasting peace. When Henry IV agreed to be "instructed" in the Catholic faith, and was actually "received" on 25th July, 1593, every one gladly accepted the new rule, except that tiny group that against their patriotism would have preferred a Spanish King: most were "too good Frenchmen to endure the domination of Spain." Henry therefore was helped

(i) By the tiredness of the nation and its discomfort under these long wars of religion.

(ii) By the devotion of the royally-appointed clergy to the royal cause.

(iii) By the patriotic sense of the French who revolted against an opposition, openly supported and encouraged by Spain.

But the occupation of Paris did not take place till 22nd March, 1594; it was the beginning of Henry IV's real reign. First Henry put himself right with the Catholics. He had to wait till 17th September, 1595 to receive absolution from Rome, as the Pope wanted to see whether his conversion was really genuine; its terms were:

(i) The restoration of the Catholic worship everywhere and its freedom even in Béarn;

(ii) The Prince of Condé, heir apparent, to be brought up a Catholic.


(iii) The decrees of the Council of Trent to be promulgated in France, except for such as disturbed public order.

(iv) A monastery to be established in every province of France.

Henry had still to meet a Spanish army, long quartered on French soil, and he had to win his country to accept him in preference to the Spanish rule. Only gradually was even Brittany reduced. Finally, Henry succeeded in driving the Spaniards out of France (except the citadel of Cambrai) after the treaty of Vervins on 2nd May, 1598. A month earlier, the *Edict of Nantes* had settled the status of the Protestants, by consolidating in favour of the Calvinists, the various royal edicts and articles locally made to them. The provisions of the Edict were:

(i) Liberty of worship was granted them in two places in each bailiwick or *sénéchaussée*.

(ii) A limited number of seigneurs were allowed public worship in their castles.

 (iii) A sum of public money was allowed for the support of Protestant schools and colleges, and bequests permitted for them.

(iv) Full civil rights were granted them and full civil protection.

(v) They had complete control of the 200 cities they held; and the King granted them money for the support of their garrisons and arms.*

But though thus Henry IV had seemed to satisfy his Protestant subjects, his reign was troubled with many of their revolts, especially after he had allowed the Jesuits to return to France in 1603. But his later policy, which led him to attack the house of Hapsburg, roused the Catholics to a belief that he was a traitor to his faith in his defence of the rebellious Netherlands. François Ravaillac, therefore, murdered him on 14th May, 1610 in the Rue de la Ferronnerie, within a week of the sailing on the proposed expedition to Germany. He died instantly.

(i) His diplomacy, except for this planned attack on the Hapsburgs, had been generally uapproved, temperate, and successful.

(ii) As a soldier he was swift and vigorous; he was before his age in his appreciation of artillery and engineering, in his careful commissariat, in his refusal to employ mercenaries, and in his care of the disabled and wounded after the war.

(iii) He subordinated religion to policy, though his conversion to Catholicism seemed to be genuine: he undoubtedly had always preferred the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist.

(iv) His administration was orderly and economic; he reduced the royal debt, suppressed the robberies of criminals

*Contrast in the Germanies and France the freedom granted to Protestantism with the intolerance of the Protestants whenever they were in the ascendancy.

and the exactions of officials, maintained excellent roads, developed the irrigation of France and planned much more which his death interrupted, developed industries, colonies, and the posts. He concentrated finance in the hands of a single superintendent; and he made the judicial posts hereditary and saleable by the heirs.

He created, more than did any single man, modern France; and his attitude to life is the attitude of Montaigne, with its suspended judgment, its wit, its deeper sense of the realities beneath the faith, its lucidity, industry, and common sense. Royal philosopher as he showed himself in that genial conversational philosophy of Montaigne, he separated the new France from the old. The absolutism of Francis continued, but the monstrous side of autocracy he laid aside.

ENGLAND

The English share in the Reform and its reactions date from the ending of the reign of Richard III, that thoroughly Renaissance prince, with his lack of moral principle, his devious political expediency, his charm and persuasiveness of manner, and his patronage of the arts. The legends about him that the flatterers of Henry VII invented or embellished (till the facts of his character are hard to establish in the wealth of fancy woven round him), may have had some foundation in fact; but they are none the less legends as we have inherited them, unproven and unprovable—his misshapen form and his murder of the little princes. No one can look at the three contemporary portraits of him without realising that the coarse and clumsy bully of tradition is no true picture of him, and that his power to win his natural enemies to his side by sheer personal charm (an undoubted gift of his) has, with his other good qualities, escaped recognition in the official lives of him, which Henry VII and his successors inspired.

But the advent of the Tudors cut short the Yorkist experiment, which might have saved the country for Catholicism. Henry VII (1485-1509) introduced, after Bosworth, a new system of government. He "brought to justice the over-mighty subjects" of the

Wars of the Roses who, with their armed retainers, had intimidated justice and incited riots, and he realised that his chance of success in the new era which was beginning, lay in his possession of wealth. His Lancastrian house had fallen through poverty. The avarice, that was most noted of him in his day, was deliberate and politic, so that his revenue rose steadily throughout all his years of reign. There was very little parliamentary taxation (only seven parliaments in twenty-four years, of which the first six were before 1504), his forced loans were almost all repaid, but his exactions fell heavily on the rich. In time he became the richest sovereign in Europe. His commercial schemes were carefully planned, so as to put the carrying trade into English hands, to open the Baltic and the Mediterranean to English ships and to prohibit gradually the export of wool in order to make England an industrial country.

But at the same time he secured the passage of acts:

(i) To compel owners of twenty acre-farms to keep in repair such buildings as were necessary for tillage, in order to maintain the English yeomanry.

(ii) To forbid the turning of arable land into pasturage.

(iii) To forbid the taking of pheasants and partridges* from other men's lands.

(iv) To prescribe the practice of archery on village greens.

His best support was the feeling of insecurity which had been experienced in England under the Lancastrian kings, for the anarchy that had prevailed under forms of constitutional order had made men think lightly of the worth of constitutional order itself. The new men, with whom he surrounded himself, showed the people that the path to equality before the law, led through absolutism. Hence the Star Chamber was instituted in 1486 to supply a justice which could not otherwise be had. It vested certain members of the Council (Chancellor, Treasurer, Privy Seal, a bishop, and a temporal lord) with criminal jurisdiction, necessary at the time, in order to restrain the abuses which had

*Partridges are said to have been introduced by the Romans. The Canons of Waltham had pheasants in the eleventh century, for they were obliged to furnish King Harold with them every festival day from Michaelmas to Lent.

grown out of the too great power of the nobles. Livery and maintenance had secured armed forces for this section of the nation, and thereby placed the local administration of justice throughout the country, under influences which utterly destroyed its independence. Moreover, since the Star Chamber Court was intended to curb these great folk, Henry VII took care to strengthen its judicial authority, by adding to its composition the two chief-justices or two other judges in their place. "He was of a high mind and loved his own will and his own way, as one that revered himself and would reign indeed . . . not admitting any near or full approach, either to his power or to his secrets"; this was Bacon's comment on him (his *Life of Henry VII* written between June and October 1621)—which means that, like the rest of the Tudors, he was his own prime minister, ready only to accept this much of constitutional principle—that his ministers and not himself were responsible for anything done amiss.

Only at the end of his reign did he forget that the good will of his subjects was as necessary to him as their money; but here, where he had failed or was failing, Henry VIII found his success, for it is undoubted that the personal popularity of Henry VIII, first as Prince of Wales and later as King, did enable him to reunite the people in their allegiance to the crown, which the last years of his father's reign had broken down. Handsome, athletic, a poet and a musician, witty, with generous friendships, an attractive manner, and at first frank and trustful, *Henry VIII* (1509-1547) came with a double welcome from his people to whom, in Bacon's phrase, his father had been "deep, but not vulgar"—the word "vulgar" in English thensignifying popularity.

But Henry the VIII's advent did little enough for England, except where he continued his father's policy in favour of navigation and of the royal navy. He soon spent, in such adventures of pageantry as the Field of the Cloth of Gold (June 1520), all that his father had saved. His house was once more reduced to the poverty of the Lancastrians; and it was this royal poverty, with the King's growing desires and lusts, that the monastic wealth so strongly tempted. Not only in the eyes of Anne Boleyn, but in gold and jewels did Henry suddenly see the "light of the Gospel."

Not only divorce, but desire of wealth, drove Henry at first towards the Reform.

In England as elsewhere the new learning had three stages:

(i) *Intellectual*, typical of which were the names of Colet, Grocyn, Erasmus, Linacre and More. This was essentially an educational revival, not involving any change in politics or religion.

(ii) *Political*, where the divorce of Katherine of Aragon brought in a rupture from the Papacy, and less completely with Charles V, her nephew.

(iii) *Religious*, after a movement (abruptly checked) towards doctrinal reform, marked by the Ten articles of 1536, Henry had strictly reaffirmed all Catholic belief (save in the primacy of the popes, defined at Florence a hundred years before) in the Six Articles of Religion.

In his general religious policy, Henry apparently had the majority of the bishops and laity with him, who were anxious for the reform of practical religious administrative abuses, but who had no desire for any large doctrinal or liturgical change. Indeed England was the one country of Christendom in which the Renaissance had never been pagan, and where culture had never ceased to be Catholic. Had it progressed, undisturbed by Henry, the English Renaissance might have saved the world. Edward's Protestant and German advisers followed the extreme anti-Catholic current of feeling, by producing Ordinals which repudiated the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence and of the sacrificial power of the priesthood. Against this, Mary had little difficulty in rallying English opinion; but she frightened her subjects by her Spanish marriage, which made them fear—in view of the sizes of the respective kingdoms—that England would develop into a mere appanage of Spain. It was an age of insurgent and insistent nationalism. Mary was too much her mother's daughter to realise the English dislike of foreign powers.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

The skill of Elizabeth (1558-1603) lay in her exploitation of this nationalism, and in her successful piloting of England between the

possible alliances which the continent offered her. The last half of the sixteenth century was, as a whole, a period of Catholic reaction. The Protestant movement, for the moment, had spent its force. The religious wars in Germany were closed by the Treaty of Augsburg in 1555. Philip II had come to the throne in Spain in 1556. The peace of Chateau-Cambrésis in 1559 had bound France and Spain to a policy of repression against the heretics. The Council of Trent, in session from 1545 to 1563, was preparing for a general reform of Catholic practice, not a reform of the Catholic Church, but a Catholic reform of the Church.

Was England to follow this rising stream of Catholic reaction? That she was not forced into it was due—

- (i) To the fact that France and Spain were rivals.
- (ii) That each Catholic power had its own difficulties:
 - (a) Spain had the Netherlands.
 - (b) France the Huguenots.
 - (c) Germany the Lutherans.
 - (d) Scotland the followers of John Knox.

Consequently no Catholic political power was able to force an issue on England, so that everything depended really on the personal character of the Queen. Insatiate in her desire for admiration, unprincipled in her moral life, even parsimonious and ungrateful, she had yet other qualities which made one of the popes exclaim that she was the only *man* in Europe. She came to the throne as a young woman, after years of isolation, but she began at once to show caution and extreme wariness, though to the end she remained clearly heiress to her family's talents; the intellect of her father, her mother's coarseness and shamelessness, and the commercial and political genius of Henry VII.

She was never really in sympathy with the English Reformers, but was heart and soul a child of the Italian Renaissance, modelling herself on the principles of *Il Principe*. She lacked enthusiasm for either of the religious faiths. Indifferent to doctrine, she inclined to Catholic Church government and ritual, all the more because she disliked the "democracy" that the Protestants seemed so bent on establishing. Nor had she any real fear that

the papal declaration of her illegitimacy after the King's marriage with Anne Boleyn, would disturb her succession. She knew of Ferrante of Naples (whose illegitimacy had been no bar to his ascending the throne); and, moreover, the Church of England had, equally with that of Rome, declared against her legitimacy—when Cranmer declared Henry's second marriage invalid, in order to facilitate a third (1535), he had also declared her illegitimate. Therefore Canterbury was no more likely than Rome to console her pride, if it had needed any such consolation. But it was because Elizabeth thought that any attempt to combine Catholic doctrine with political independence from the Catholic powers would fail, that she broke with Rome: for the breach was manifestly her doing. She would not notify the Pope of her accession; she did not confirm in his post, as ambassador at the papal Court, her sister's ambassador, Sir Edward Carne—whose body fitly lies buried in the Church on the Cœlian Hill, whence had come S. Augustine and his monks at Gregory's bidding to convert the English to the Faith. In 1559, within a year of her accession, she passed the Act of Supremacy, which restored the royal supremacy of Henry VIII's reign and conferred on the crown all ecclesiastical authority of reformation and visitation. It decreed that an oath of supremacy was to be taken by all clerics in benefices, by all accepting crown payment or at the universities, under pain of forfeiting office and by all persons who "maliciously and directly affirm, hold, stand with, set forth, maintain or defend the authority, pre-eminence, power or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, of any foreign prince, prelate, person, state or potentate." For the third offence against this statute, the penalty was death and forfeiture, as in the case of High Treason.

This was followed by the Act of Uniformity in 1559 which "deprived" whoever refused to accept the new form of worship, and, if he continued contumacious, sentenced him "to suffer imprisonment during his life." Legally, indeed, care was taken to hide any breach with the past, historic Church; but in doctrine and in liturgy the whole nation knew that a change had been made. It was only ten years later that Pope Pius V, in 1569,

promulgated his Bull of Deposition. A year earlier, Cardinal Allen (his statue graces the new front of Oriel College on the High Street at Oxford) had founded the English College at Douay; ten years later Gregory XIII (1579) founded the English College in Rome.

In spite of the solemn attitude of the popes, a Catholic petition was taken to the Queen, signed and approved by many Catholics by which they maintained

(i) That they all, lay and clerical, held her as true *de jure* sovereign.

(ii) That they held it sinful for any man to lift a hand against her.

(iii) That they held no pope or priest could give any one leave to perform a sinful act.

(iv) That if any one held anything opposite to this, he was a heretic to the Catholic faith.

This petition was taken to the Queen by Richard Shelley of Michael Gore in Sussex; but he was promptly imprisoned—which was all the answer she gave to it. The secular clergy also sent a similar petition ending with the assertion that they were equally ready to die for her and for their faith. What it contained was certainly the truth: “The very papists themselves being no less unwilling than the rest to see their native country in subjection to the ordinary cruelty found in strangers,” said a letter sent over to Mendoza. But Elizabeth’s temper was not a liberal one; she feared the immense power of the papacy, she was a Tudor and could share power with no one, she was determined to follow no one’s advice in whatever was not perfectly clear to her. When the Emperor Ferdinand commended her to practise toleration, and exhorted her to grant one Church at least in each populous city for the exercise of Catholic worship, she declined this as “a thing evil in itself and unprofitable to those for whom it was required.”

Yet Elizabeth in her foreign policy always counted on the loyalty of her Catholic subjects, for she knew she could aid Protestant rebels in the Netherlands and in Scotland, without any fear of Philip II or of Queen Mary of Scotland being able to

rouse Catholics in England against herself. The plots, in which various Catholics were involved, that did occur, were known to the government almost from the first; but the bulk of the nation was Catholic and yet it never rose against her. She disliked the Calvinists of Scotland because of their anti-monarchical beliefs, and she could hardly be sympathetic with John Knox after he had published his "First blast of a trumpet against the monstrous regimen of women," even though he tried to conciliate her by saying that she was 'an exception allowed by God for the comfort of the Kirk.'

But she wanted to keep Philip busy in some troubles of his own, and to make *Mary of Scotland* impotent to advance any pretensions to the English throne. Hence she stirred up the Netherlands against Philip, and made her treaty of Edinburgh in 1560 with Scotland, whereby the French were to withdraw from that country, the offices of State to be in the hands of Scotsmen, a provisional government was to be established of twelve Scottish nobles in the absence of the Queen, and the King and Queen of France were to give up any claims on the crown of England and Ireland. Not a word was said about religion, but Elizabeth knew that she had unleashed the Scottish Protestants, who promptly abolished episcopacy as well as the pope, prohibited mass (for the third offence under the death penalty), and adopted Calvinism. Elizabeth refused to acknowledge Mary as her heir-presumptive; that would point too easily to her own taking off; but promised that Parliament should do nothing to prejudice Mary's claims.

Then began the long problem of Elizabeth's reign that was only ended by "a blow at Fotheringhay."

Mary's subsequent marriage with Darnley frightened Elizabeth, for Darnley also had some claims on the English succession. As Mary wrote: "Darnley was of the blood of England and Scotland, next to myself in the succession, a Stewart by name, so as to keep still the surname so pleasing to the Scotch, of the same religion as myself and who would respect me as he would be obliged, by the honour I did him." She resolved to marry him (1565), and gratify "if not all, at least the respectable party, the

Catholics, and those of my own surname." She determined to submit neither to France nor Spain, but to consolidate the independence of Scotland and of the Catholic faith. But with Darnley's murder (1567), and her speedy marriage with the Protestant Bothwell ("nor did he cease till by persuasion and importunate suit accompanied with force he had driven me to end the work") de Silva (Philip's envoy in Scotland) wrote to his master "the spirits of the Catholics are broken." The rising of the Scots lords followed (1567), Mary was captured and imprisoned, set free, abdicated in favour of James, then escaped to England (1568). Elizabeth's personal desire was to send Mary back as a vassal sovereign on the Scottish throne.

But the plots that now followed, with the avowed object of liberating Mary, assassinating Elizabeth, and placing Mary on Elizabeth's throne, played into the hands of those of the Queen's Council who perpetually urged on Elizabeth the need for Mary's death. Indeed, so apposite to their policy were these plots, that there were not wanting foreign observers in England at the time who wondered whether the government was not itself provoking plots, in order to stifle them, and then proceed to a public policy which, without these plots, would have had no popular justification. Elizabeth's dislike of putting Mary to death, much as that death would have benefited her, was due—

(i) To her personal belief in the sanctity of kings and queens, and not liking to see rough hands laid on a consecrated head.

(ii) To shrinking from harming one related to her so closely as Mary was (none was as closely her kin), and like her a lonely woman.

(iii) To her political sagacity in fearing what the effect of it would be on the situation of Europe.

Elizabeth ordered her, however, to be tried by a special commission, October 14th to October 25th, in 1586; she was judged and found guilty, despite Mary's refusal to acknowledge its competence to try her, an independent sovereign. The new Parliament held the next year petitioned for the death sentence which Elizabeth, at first refusing, finally approved; the death

warrant was signed on February 1st and on February 8th, 1587 Mary Queen of Scots was beheaded.

The results of this were in fact:

(a) At home the ending of plots against Elizabeth's rule or person.

(b) Abroad it allowed Philip to strike openly and directly at her; till now he had misliked striking down Elizabeth, when he knew that the French party of Mary Queen of Scots would triumph, and the Guise would gain. With Mary Stuart out of the way, each blow would tell for his cause only. After this he did not hesitate to strike.

Up till now Elizabeth and Philip had faced each other for thirty years of warlike peace; her ministers long wanted her to attack Spain, and Elizabeth had steadily refused. She had no wish for war since her people were poor, her army was small, her population only four and a half millions, to the twelve millions in Spain and Portugal over whom Philip ruled. She preferred to support his domestic enemies sufficiently to prevent them from being crushed, and to keep him occupied, but not sufficiently to give them a clean victory, or to embroil her in open war with him. To avoid this last she would not even accept, after the murder of William the Silent, the crown of the Netherlands (1585).

Meanwhile her adventurers fought with the Spaniards on the high seas. That, she held was mere piracy, not war.

England had entered late into colonial competition with other nations:

(i) She had no pressure of population to urge her to develop colonies, since she had been depleted by the Black Death.

(ii) Hers was not an ardent commercial people, but agricultural and pastoral.

(iii) The English had no missionary zeal such as inspired Spanish and Portuguese.

Yet when England did get caught with the fever of adventure (note in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* Act I. Sc. III

"Some to the wars to seek their fortune there
Some to discover islands far away
Some to the studious universities"

an epigrammatic summary of the Elizabethian youth of England), she was swept by it into war with Spain—

(i) Owing to the exclusive commercial policy adopted and enforced by Spain, in respect of its West Indian and American settlements.

(ii) Owing to the assistance given by English Government to Philip's rebellious subjects in the Low Countries.

Hatred of the Inquisition, sometimes given as one reason of the war, or popular dislike for the cruelty of the Spaniards, does not really seem to have had any effect on public opinion or government policy, for

(i) Philip considered heresy to be only as dangerous to the state as Elizabeth considered Catholicism to be.

(ii) His prisons were no more unsavoury than the English prisons of the time.

(iii) His slaughtering of prisoners seems to have been no more reckless than the English slaughtering of prisoners from Agincourt onwards.

These English adventurers, when they came, were one of three types:

(a) *Explorers*, searching for a North West passage to India and for an escape from the Spanish and Portuguese lines; Willoughby, Davis and Frobisher are the chief names.

(b) *Buccaneers*, preying on foreign trade; Hawkins with administrative ability, Drake by his seamanship and daring, the creators of the Navy. Drake secured in his lifetime the romantic title of "the Pilgrim of the World," a far too complimentary epitaph for one who lacked most of the virtues, except courage ("fearing no more the sea than a dish of water").

(c) *Colonists* like Sir Humphrey Gilbert and his half-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, who planned and attempted a permanent settlement on American soil.

When the Armada finally sailed, it was to meet a navy which under these three types had risen to the condition of a skilled and sharpened instrument. The great fight of the Armada took place finally on July 29th (old style, on August 8th in the new) 1588; the ships were scattered, and the beaten enemy destroyed

by an ensuing storm. But before the storm came, the Spaniards had suffered defeat. The English victory was due—

- (i) To better seamanship.
- (ii) To better tactics (four broadsides to one).
- (iii) To better gunnery (nineteen hits to one).
- (iv) To the Spaniards fighting a naval battle with land forces.

The English outnumbered the Spaniards in sailors, in fighting ships, and in guns, and won chiefly, because the Armada was not a fleet, but a convoy for a land army to invade English shores.

After 1588 Elizabeth came into peaceful times; like Victoria, at her reign's ending, she had already become a legend to her people. She had been raised above "the warrior Kings of old," her councillors dropped off through death, her home politics were peaceful, her people wealthy, the literary glories exalted her in men's eyes; the youth of the nation, poets, writers, soldiers, were captured by the glory which her reign had brought to England, and were servile in their praise.

But the one fatal flaw in the Tudor dictatorship, as far as the continuance of that dictatorship was concerned, had been the spoiling of the monastic lands; this primarily, and then this, supplemented by the practice of enclosures, the expansion of trade, and the very success of the war with Spain, created a strong middle-class and revived the independence of Parliament. With these two new forces the Stuarts were to contend and be defeated. These were the legacy of Elizabeth to the next line of kings, restrained by her personal fame, but visible to her as dangers, disliked and feared.

THE STUARTS

Into this domestic quarrel of the Stuarts and the Parliament, this History of Europe need not go; it is sufficient to notice it and to remember that it was complicated for the Stuarts, by the fact that they succeeded to the English throne in defiance of an act of Parliament. Henry VIII had been given by Parliament leave to determine by will the succession; he had determined it by bequeathing it to his own children, and then (if his children were to

lack heirs) to the children of his sister, Mary, Duchess of Suffolk, who were to succeed before the Scottish heirs. James I, inheriting in opposition to this Parliamentary Act, was therefore obliged to defend his succession on the theory of the Divine Right of kings; from this original mistake, from his pedantic temper, and from his foreign blood, French and Scotch, at the most intensely national moment in English history, came the beginnings of that unsettlement of the Tudor dictatorship, of which the fruits were the Revolution of 1688 and the oligarchy of the Whigs.

The foreign policy dictated by the Stuart rule under James I was definite but ineffective; its main principle being based on the opinion of James, that an alliance between England and Spain would establish the religious equilibrium of Europe; wise in some ways, but extremely unpopular in England, it broke down under the *Thirty Years War* (1618-1648), which, beginning as a war for the Bohemian succession,

(i) Developed into a war between the Emperor and certain Imperial princes, the Elector Frederick of the Palatinate being elected to the throne of Bohemia, and his election being supported against the Emperor by some of the princes of Germany.

(ii) Became complicated by a further development into a religious war between Catholics and Protestants, and between imperialists and disruptionists.

(iii) It was again further complicated by the intervention of Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, as a Protestant ally against the Catholic League of the Baltic.

(iv) It ended in a personal quarrel between the kings of France and Spain for the supremacy of Europe.

James did not dissuade the Elector from accepting the Bohemian crown, but also did not protest when Spain was invited in, to expel the Elector even from his own Palatinate, by Maximilian of Bavaria, who had set his eyes on the Palatinate, and hoped to possess it himself in the name of his Catholicism; nor did James give any effective aid to the expelled Elector. Then, after the war had been already begun, he swung over to the side of France, substituted the policy of a French marriage for "the Spanish match" that had brought such ridicule on the futile journey of

Prince Charles to Spain in search of a princess who would not have him; and then later again, since the French crown was attacking the Huguenots at La Rochelle (1627-1629), Charles I altered the national policy to a war with France. The failure of the expedition to La Rochelle necessitated a forced loan, which raised the question which centred round the episode of the Five Members and of the Petition of Right (1628), and finally of the royal right to exact extraordinary taxation, ship-money and the rest (1637).

It was from these necessities of the French war then, that there came the quarrel, under Charles I, between King and Parliament and from that quarrel the Civil War (1642-1649); not of course that the necessities of the French war were the cause, but the occasion, of it. From it sprang even the fatality of the King's execution: (1649) with its repercussion over Europe: "Many subjects in Europe," wrote Secretary May, "have played louder parts upon the theatre of the world, but none left it with greater noise, nor was the matter of his accusation confined within one realm; three whole kingdoms were his accusers and eagerly sought in one death a recompense of all their sufferings."

Yet though at first the foreign war of Charles had precipitated affairs, and his foreign marriage with a French princess had antagonised those of his subjects who were still afraid, not of Catholicism, but of any tolerance for it; yet when Cromwell, after him was free to consider a foreign policy, and, after careful weighing of the balances, had thought one out for himself, he agreed with Charles in deciding for an alliance with France against Spain. King Charles II did but continue the whole policy of the Protector in its main line, though doubtless he had reasons of his own for so doing; nevertheless, in the quarrel between Spain and France, whenever England had to take one side—except in the solitary instance of James I's personal choice—the rulers of England chose France as their ally.

IRELAND

The Reformation hardly touched the Irish people till the reign of Elizabeth. The Tudors in their government of Ireland, had

each begun with good intentions, to adopt a policy of conciliation after the terrible years that had preceded the rule of Henry VIII; the annals of the *Four Masters* (a rambling history of Ireland from the Conquest to 1616) gives a picture of the misery and chaos of Ireland at the time, and show the English Pale as its most misgoverned, most overtaxed, and most unprotected district.

But this attempted conciliation of the Tudors failed—

(i) Already there was a tradition of officials and soldiers, who looked on Ireland as a gold mine and the Irish as “native dogs.” The records prove a steady growth in corruption.

(ii) Commerce and agriculture were neglected for the creation of new salaried offices.

(iii) There was a tactless enforcement of irritating regulations.

(iv) Everywhere, men saw treachery and injustice, whenever coercive measures were adopted, e.g. the dealing with Shane and Hugh O'Neill (1560 and 1595).

(v) The officials adopted an unmitigated policy of extermination, whenever it came to fighting.

(vi) There remained the persistent difficulty of co-ordinating *brehon* and feudal claims.

(vii) On every side there was a perpetual air of intrigue, against the Deputy by his own officials if he were strong, and against the Irish Chiefs if he were weak.

Under Elizabeth, the key-note of her policy to Ireland was her fear of its invasion from abroad. Its command was essential to her in her struggle with Spain. Hence she was

(i) Only interested in Ireland in so far as she needed to secure in it the safety of England.

(ii) Convinced she could not allow the slightest sign of unquiet in Ireland to pass unpunished.

Hence the various policies adopted by her deputies included:

(a) Attempts at planting English settlers amongst the Irish.

(b) The establishment of special officers, with arbitrary powers in most hostile regions.

(c) The proclamation of martial law.

To the King of Spain, Ireland seemed to afford an opportunity for paying Elizabeth back for her encouragement of his revolting Netherlands; and the King of France saw in Ireland, an equal opportunity of retaliating on her for her unofficial support of the Huguenots. The crown of Ireland was accordingly offered by the anti-English alliance, first to Henry III of France, and then to Don John of Austria: but in neither case was it accepted. Gregory XIII however, accepted it in the end for his nephew. Twice the Spaniards landed in Ireland, in 1579 and 1601, but Philip had too much on hand to prosecute the affair sufficiently vigorously. The Irish had no more desire to be ruled by Spain than by England, and would not rise in his support, so that neither invasion gave at any time any prospect of success. Only Hugh O'Neill Earl of Tyrone (possibly the ablest man in Irish history) might have succeeded in establishing a complete independence, had Philip backed him with a full and efficient force. He had fought for the English against his revolting kinsman, Shane O'Neill, and he knew the resources and the secrets of the English command. But though he rose in strength, the English commander was too strong for him, since he lacked what had been promised—full Spanish support.

He failed because—

(i) Mountjoy reorganised his troops on a religious basis, and gave up the old military policy of raids for one of building block houses (1601).

(ii) The suspicion amongst the Irish themselves of Tyrone's personal ambition, divided them from whole-heartedly following his lead.

A weakened Irish force under Tyrone was defeated outside Kinsale, and the Spanish in Kinsale surrendered (1601); Tyrone was harried into Ulster, admitted his treason, renounced Spain, and was allowed to resume his Earldom, but not acknowledged any longer as an independent tribal chieftain. He submitted on 30th March, 1603, when Elizabeth had been dead six days. Had

he known this, he would probably have held out and perhaps won through.

Meanwhile, the destruction of Catholics in Ireland, under Henry VIII, had included the suppression of the monasteries (here as elsewhere in Europe the chief civilising centres in the country), the confiscation of Church funds and the impoverishment of the clergy, and the removal of the Irish speaking priests, which meant that there were none others to put in their places. Moreover, the new bishops, imported under the Reformation, were servile and indolent.

Under Mary, though Catholicism was restored in 1555, and Ireland made a kingdom, the monasteries were not re-established and the bishops appointed were still all English. Under Elizabeth, the Irish Act of Uniformity—

(i) Imposed the Prayer-Book and compelled attendance at Church under fine.

(ii) Established Protestant Schools in every diocese.

(iii) The English language was made compulsory in the Churches and schools.

Till 1569, it was not uncommon for the inhabitants to have heard Mass in the morning, and the Protestant service in the afternoon; so uncertain was the enforcement of the new laws. Edmund Spencer, as Deputy, urged the establishment of Trinity College in opposition to the universities of the continent, to which the young Irishmen were now flocking, as part of a general system of teaching Protestantism, through Irish clergy, in the Irish tongue. Bacon advocated tolerance to Catholicism, in order to remove all grounds for disloyalty, and to sever the Irish from their foreign allies. His advice was not followed; and in the next century through the persecutions, the Irish and English Catholics in Ireland were fused into a nationality founded on religious identity, and were welded still more closely together on the anvil, in Ireland, of the Presbyterians.

When James I wished to continue the original conciliatory policy of Queen Elizabeth, he had an opportunity after the revolt of the Earls, who had been goaded into opposition by

unjust suspicion and ill-proved rebellion. The whole carrying out of the policy, however, was mismanaged:

(i) The Irish first ought to have been installed on the land taken from the tribes, and the English and Scotch introduced as opportunity could be found for them.

(ii) By confiscating all the land of the revolting tribes, and not bargaining with individuals, the government implicitly recognised the validity of the tribal land law.

(iii) By settling the English and Scotch in blocks, so as not to be swamped, and relegating the Irish to native reserves (by ousting the Irish from all defensible positions, and establishing the colonists within castles and walled enclosures), by forbidding the colonists to alienate land to the Irish, and forbidding the Irish even to hold land under the colonists, the scheme showed definitely that its purpose was to secure the safety of the English rule, and not to satisfy Irish interests.

The injustice of this proceeding has never been assuaged in popular minds, for no peace or order came of it. Even violence might not have had such disruptive results, had it been followed up by a more tactful policy afterwards. But the Irish lost in every way and gained in no way at all.

Into the same confused problem, came the vigour and impatient desire of Wentworth to save Ireland through English ideas, and his unprincipled actions to effect this (1633); then followed the vacillation of Charles I, and his attempts to impose Protestantism, and finally the calculated massacres of Cromwell, and the intolerance of the English Parliament. The result of all this was inevitable; it left a permanent bitterness and continued hostility, in which religious was added to the intensity of racial animosity.

THE THIRTY YEARS WAR

In Europe at the ending of the sixteenth century, came the complete reaction against Protestantism which precipitated the Thirty Years War. This was due to the impossibility of the peace of Augsburg in 1555 to achieve a final success; its failure was due

(i) To the various interpretations put on some of its clauses

GERMANY

At the commencement of the 30 Years War. 1618.



Ecclesiastical States in the hands of Protestants

Ecclesiastical States in the hands of Catholics.

Protestant Lay States.

Catholic Lay States.

Dominions of the two Branches of the House of Austria.

(for instance, the proviso that clerical lands secularised before 1552 were to continue secularised, if they were within Protestant territories, was clear enough: but did the date mean that clerical lands could not legally be secularised after it, or did the clause lay down a general principle always applicable in Protestant territories, and permitting the further secularisation of clerical lands within those territories?).

(ii) To its particular reference to Lutheranism and not Calvinism (both now so opposed to each other, that the Lutherans would lift no finger to secure the rights of the Calvinists).

Hence what happened was—

(i) The formation of a Calvinist League in the Rhineland, headed by the Elector Palatine in 1608, and joined by Strasbourg and Nuremburg.

(ii) The formation of a Catholic League, chiefly of South Germany, and headed by Maximilian of Bavaria.

(iii) Their collision over the succession to the Duchies of Cleves and Jülich, Catholic territories claimed by two Protestant heirs:

(a) The Count Palatine of Neuburg, husband of the younger daughter of William the Rich, the last Duke but one.

(b) The Elector of Brandenburg, the grandson of the elder daughter of William the Rich, to whom William by will had given preference in succession.

The dispute was partly religious, on the principle that the territory had to follow the religion of the prince; and partly political, for these duchies were promptly occupied by the Emperor till the matter should be settled, and thereby the United Provinces of Holland, France, and the North German Protestants considered themselves menaced by the presence of the Hapsburg on their borders. It was in this collision of Calvinists and Catholics, in which the former were backed by Holland and France, and the latter by the Emperor, that war was only temporally averted by the assassination of Henry IV of France.

Meanwhile, the origins of the Thirty Years War* had begun in

*Note its four stages: 1619-1623 Palatine; 1625-1629 Danish; 1630-1635 Swedish; 1635-1648 French.

this wise. In Austria, Hungary, and Bohemia, there had been revolts in favour of Protestant minorities, and in each case, first the Emperor (Rudolph II, 1576-1612), and then his brother Mathias (who took his place as King in Austria and Hungary, and eventually as Emperor, 1612-1619), granted toleration to the dissenting groups. Eventually the Cleves-Jülich Duchy dispute was settled by a division of the Duchy into two parts, Cleves going to Brandenburg, who had turned Calvinist, and Jülich to Neuburg, who had turned Catholic.

Mathias, having found peace in his time, wished to do his best to leave peace as his inheritance, and so, childless, determined to secure the succession to the Empire for Ferdinand of Styria, his cousin, who had already an heir. The hereditary estates of the Hapsburgs were easily secured for him; the Kingdom of Hungary duly elected him; the estates of Bohemia were suddenly presented with him, and urged to acknowledge him as the constitutional successor of Mathias, which implied a surrender of their right to elect their own sovereign. They agreed and swore fealty. But when all was done, they were persuaded by Count Henry of Thurn to renounce their oath, and to declare their own independence. This independence was short lived, for neither the Protestantism of the people nor their political unity was sufficiently strong to enable them long to oppose the forces of Ferdinand.

But while the Bohemians were ready to submit, there were other princes who were anxious to hamper the Emperor, and to prevent the counter-reformation re-possession (as it threatened to do) the Protestant districts. Frederick, the Elector Palatine, son-in-law to James I of England, and Charles Emmanuel of Savoy joined forces to defend the Bohemians, which meant that Frederick, impetuously and openly, did so, while Charles Emmanuel sent his troops and their general, and pretended that he had not authorised their intervention. But the joint forces of the confederates met with success. Such success indeed did they meet, that Austria, then largely Protestant, seeing the Hapsburgs in trouble, broke out into revolt and sought aid from the Bohemians.

The Emperor Mathias in the March of 1619 died.

Ferdinand II (1619-1637) succeeded him in Vienna, and was immediately besieged there from without, and was attacked within, by his own people who urged on him the necessity

(a) Of giving Bohemia its independence.

(b) Of establishing in Austria a separate Protestant government.

Pushed to the uttermost he still refused; in the very crisis of his refusal, when he still refused to be bullied into surrender (1619), troops arrived in Vienna to his aid. When he had thus narrowly escaped from his peril, he had to hurry to Frankfort to secure his election to the Imperial throne. Here the Elector of Saxony at first protested against Ferdinand's claim to have the Bohemian vote, on the ground of the disputed kingship; but the Elector Palatine and the Elector of Brandenburg refused to accept a policy dictated by Saxony, and endeavoured to discover another way out. Saxony, furious at this refusal to follow him, withdrew his promise and accepted Ferdinand as King of Bohemia, and voted for his election: Ferdinand therefore had five votes out of the seven, his own, the vote of Saxony, and the votes of the three Archbishops. Seeing themselves outvoted, the recalcitrant two threw in their votes with the others; and Ferdinand became Emperor with a unanimous vote.

The Elector Palatine had by his vacillation and by his vote uncrowned himself; the election of Ferdinand to the Empire gave the latter resources wider than he would otherwise have had. These resources were brought immediately into play and against the Elector Palatine. On August 28th, 1619, Ferdinand was elected Emperor; on August 18th he was deposed by the Bohemian estates as King of Bohemia; on August 27th the Elector Palatine was elected King in his place; on September 25th he accepted the kingship of Bohemia; on November 4th he was crowned at Prague.

In 1618 the Thirty Years War began in real earnest:

(i) King James I, whose foreign policy turned on an alliance with Spain refused to support his impetuous son-in-law against the Emperor (1619).

(ii) The leaders of Bohemia and the Elector Palatine were Calvinists. Their allies were the Calvinist League. This in itself was enough to put at least into neutrality, the Lutheran princes of Germany who had no wish to see Geneva dictating to them.

(iii) Maximilian of Bavaria was on the side of Catholicism against the Calvinists, and the three Episcopal Electors were necessarily with him. At the head of the army of Bavaria was Tilly, the most famous general of the time.

(iv) Even the Elector of Saxony, Lutheran as he was, saw in the action of Frederick of the Palatinate a revolutionary movement contrary to his consistent conservative policy, so he sided with the Emperor.

The first stroke of war was the invasion of the Palatinate, the destruction of Frederick's army, and his flight to Holland after the battle of the White Mountain on 8th November, 1620. This ended the Protestantism of Bohemia, for the Protestant party had been the revolutionary party; it was dispossessed and proscribed: in Silesia and Lusatia religious toleration was allowed by the intervention of the Elector of Saxony. Ferdinand recognised this arrangement.

In 1623 the Palatinate, cleared of Frederick's forces and Frederick's allies, was handed over to Maximilian of Bavaria, who thus entered the Electoral College.

(i) Meanwhile "the Spanish match" had been rejected between England and Spain by Spain, the Prince of Wales sent back to England unwedded, and James I realised that he had been made to appear a fool. For a monarch who boasted of his wisdom, this was galling. His reply was to intervene in Germany by negotiating an alliance with the Northern powers of the Baltic, and to allow the recruitment of volunteers for Frederick, and the building of ships for him. In 1625, James died and the work went on more freely still.

(ii) Denmark had begun to feel uncomfortable at the success of the Catholic League, especially as King Christian was hoping to secure for one of his sons, the succession to the protestantised bishopric of Bremen, which the success of the Catho-

lics would prevent. The offer of an English and Dutch subsidy brought him into alliance (1625).

But now the troubles between Charles I and his Parliaments began to affect the vigour of English co-operation; the few English adventurers did not succeed in any of their efforts; the Elizabethan ardour had died with the Queen.

The alliance however, of England, Denmark, and the Lutheran princes of Saxony gave to the Elector's side, an accession of strength which would have put the Emperor at a disadvantage, had he not at that moment received a far more valuable support in the person of Wallenstein, half Protestant, half Catholic, educated by the Moravian Brethren and then by the Jesuits, the greatest general of his age, and yet with an outlook on imperial affairs and on European politics, that gave him a greatness beyond mere success in war. On Ferdinand's side were now the two chief leaders of war, Tilly the Walloon from Flanders, and Wallenstein the Czech from Bohemia; on the other side, Mansfeld was the only general who had shown any genius, but he was inferior to either of the others, and, moreover, had antagonised whatever country he had marched through by his brutality, his robbery, and his encouragement of his troops to plunder. The Protestant cause was thus associated in men's minds with intolerance, lack of discipline, and immorality. More than any single person, he had destroyed whatever sympathy there was among the people for the cause of the Reform.

First, the Danes were defeated and driven back by Tilly in 1626, and then Mansfeld, leading his army and the revolted Hungarians, was defeated. He had even to disband his army at the end of the same year. Denmark was then invaded, the King chased on to his islands, and peace made with him at Lubeck 1629. He had to renounce his claims on the reversion of Bremen for his Bishop-son.

Peace would have come now, and been gladly welcomed by most of Germany and Scandinavia, had not Ferdinand issued his Edict of Restitution (29th March, 1629), restoring to Catholicism all the ecclesiastical land secularised since the peace of Augsburg in 1555. Men were willing to accept the restoration of the old

religion, but drew back when they found that restoration also included the restoration of its lands. As Mary had found in England, so did Ferdinand in his Empire, namely that to dispossess the owners of Church land already secularised, seemed at once to those owners to be an act of glaring revolution. By that act, the peace of Germany was disturbed. Its immediate effects were of importance:

(a) Wallenstein was dismissed because he disliked the religious policy of Ferdinand and wished (like the *Politiques* of France) to dissociate political freedom from religious uniformity.

(b) Sweden, frightened at the success of the Catholic League, determined, under a young and triumphant monarch, to defend herself by an attack on the Empire.

The history of Sweden had certain similarities with the history of England:

(i) Gustavus Vasa (1523-1560) had realised Lutheranism to be from the point of view of the Sovereign, the ideal state-religion; and by confiscating the monastic lands, had enriched himself and, by distributing some of them, placated the nobility.

(ii) He had been later (1592) succeeded by Sigismund of the Tyrol, already elected King of Poland (1587), and now King of Sweden (1592). This meant a Catholic reaction.

(iii) Sigismund had subsequently been expelled by his nephew Charles IX (1604-1611), who reintroduced Lutheranism as the state religion, and was induced later to come into alliance with the English and the Dutch.

(iv) Gustavus Adolphus (1611-1632), the son of Charles IX, had received from his father a kingdom unified at home, but threatened or impeded in its development by its three neighbouring kingdoms. His policy was therefore to attack each of the three in turn.

His wars were deliberate and successive:

A. *Denmark* (1611-1613), which still possessed some Swedish towns in the southern provinces; these Gustavus secured by the mediation of England,

B. *Russia* (1614-1617), which threatened Sweden by her hold on the Baltic; a war against the first of the Romanoffs secured, again by English mediation, a stretch of Baltic coast which shut Russia out entirely from the Baltic sea, since already Finland had been made Swedish.

C. *Poland* (1617-1629), which seemed to be the spear-head of the Counter-Reformation, was next deliberately attacked, and in the end was made to surrender Livonia and part of Prussia.

D. *The Empire* (1630-1632) was now free for him to attack, and he threw himself into this new war as deliberately as into the others, partly for religious motives, partly for political motives to oppose the political Counter Reformation under the Emperor, and partly to open a wider sphere for Swedish trade. He tried to get England to finance him, and he found Charles I ready enough to promise, but unable to pay cash down. Gustavus would not move without the cash. France, however, under Richelieu was, for other reasons, as hostile to Ferdinand as Gustavus was; France (1631) therefore agreed by the Treaty of Bärwalde, to pay him a subsidy in advance on condition:

- (i) That he respected the imperial constitution.
- (ii) That he observed the neutrality of the League.
- (iii) That he recognised the Catholic religion wherever it was already established.

The war opened by a few skirmishes between Gustavus and Tilly, all in Tilly's favour, till the victory of Magdeburg ended in the fall and destruction of that city by the troops of Pappenheim, the imperial general, in 1631. This was a crushing blow for Gustavus, whose interference in the struggle now was seen to be no longer a bid for religious freedom, but merely a foreign invasion, and it antagonised the Lutherans of Germany. At this moment, when Gustavus could have been sent home without more fighting, so discouraged was he by his failure, the Emperor foolishly quarrelled with the Elector of Saxony, by claiming the right to disband the Saxon forces. The Elector, always conservative, opposed this imperial claim, and, when his territory was invaded, cast in his lot immediately with the Swedes; much as he loved Germany, he loved more the constitutional rights of the

confederate states, and hated the possible tyranny of imperial autocracy.

The war now entered upon five brief stages:

(i) The destruction of Tilly's force by Gustavus, at the battle of Breitenfield (17th September, 1631), and the occupation of the great cities of North Germany, of Bavaria and of Bohemia, by the victorious alliance of the Protestants.

(ii) The recall of Wallenstein to the Imperial side in 1631, on the double condition of his being in sole military command, and of the promise of religious tolerance throughout Germany.

(iii) The siege of Nuremburg by Wallenstein, the retreat of Gustavus, the invasion of Bohemia and Saxony, and the battle of Lützen on November 16th, 1632, in which Gustavus, though victorious, was killed, and Wallenstein left a second time the military dictator of the Empire.

(iv) The dismissal of Wallenstein in 1634, by the Emperor who had again grown frightened of his power, and his assassination, on the 25th of February, by Devereux, an Irish captain in the Emperor's service.

(v) The defeat of the Swedes and Saxons on 6th of September, 1634, by King Ferdinand of Hungary, at Nordlingen, and the peace of Prague in May, 1635.

The result of the Thirty Years War was to substitute 1627 for 1555 as the fixed date for the delimitation of Protestantism in Germany, and therefore to block the advance of the revolution on Europe.

CHAPTER VIII

ABSOLUTISM OR REVOLUTION

LAST STAGES OF THIRTY YEARS WAR

THE war that had been ended in the Germanies with the peace of Prague in 1635 went on, almost unabated, in the Netherlands for many years after that. The struggle had, however, ceased to be even ostensibly a war of religion, for France now came more definitely into it, and on the opposite side to the Empire and to Spain, though these three Powers were all ranged amongst the Catholic forces and were in theory opposed to the Reform.

But France had never properly accepted the politics of the Counter-Reformation, largely because the politics of the Counter-Reformation were dictated by Spain. She was too near to Spain to care to be friendly with her, especially in the early years, when Spain loomed so largely in the life of Europe; France was afraid of being overwhelmed and absorbed by her, and to preserve her independence was always opposing the projects of her Southern neighbour—sometimes by diplomacy, sometimes by war.

After the disruptive tendency of the Protestant princes in Germany had been quelled by the victories of the Imperial army, and Sweden had been beaten back on to her own coasts, France considered that it was time to interfere, and deliberately took up the side of Sweden and fought to redress the balance of wealth which, in her eyes, the victories of the Emperor's armies had destroyed. Henceforward religion ceased to be the real motive for war, and commerce began to take its place. This was not altogether because religion had lost its interest, but because commerce was now seen to be more worth fighting for than had earlier been supposed. No doubt, often in the past nations had gone to war for economic motives, but now these motives were publicly recog-

nised in the new moral condition of Europe to be sufficiently grave in themselves to constitute a just cause of war. Once upon a time they would have been hidden under forms of a legal claim to crown or territory, but now they were openly professed as sufficient cause for fighting, and as such were submitted to the public conscience of the new Christendom and approved.

The two competing groups were on one side France, Holland and Sweden, and on the other the Hapsburg house in Austria and Spain and the confederate German princes of Saxony, Bavaria and Brandenburg. Soon after the opening of hostilities, the French and Swedish won two important victories:—

(i) In 1638, Bernard of Saxe-Weimar captured Alsace at the head of the Swedish army, and held the Valley of the Rhine; at his death, in 1639, the French took over the command of his army and held Alsace.

(ii) In 1639, the Dutch defeated the Spanish Fleet in the Downs (a patch of the North Sea) and thus severed the sea-communication between Spain and her expeditionary armies in her revolted provinces. The Spanish force in the Netherlands was now doubly isolated, since both the Rhine and the Channel were in the hands of her foes; moreover, shortly after this the Catalonians, who once in the Middle Ages had nearly become a separate republic, and who were always insistent upon their autonomy within the Spanish State, rebelled against the enforcement of their military service in the French war, and, aided by the French, were able to make head against Olivarez, the Minister who governed Spain in the name of Philip IV.

Portugal also was able to reassert its independence under the leadership of a descendant of an illegitimate son of John I of Portugal (d. 1433), and Spain had impotently to watch this further loss to her power and prestige and to see Portugal's independence recognised by every country in Europe outside the Empire (December 1640).

Driven to exert her power against her chief antagonist, the Spaniards now invaded France; but though occasionally winning some minor battles and driving an invading French army out of

Spain, on the whole the armies of Olivarez were unsuccessful. They suffered two great defeats. First, Rousillon surrendered to France (1642); and, secondly, the Spanish army of the Netherlands was destroyed by the Duc d'Enghien (known as Prince of Condé after 1646) at Rocroi (May 19th, 1643). This was a final blow as far as Spain herself was concerned.

In Germany there had been a much less uneven contest, but in Turenne and Condé the French had discovered generals whose sagacity and genius was of the same order as Tilly's and Wallenstein's in a generation earlier. It was Turenne, rather than any superior fighting qualities of the French, that gave them the fruits of the campaign. Yet, even so, the story of the war is the story of a perpetual swaying of victory from one side to the other; and the story also of alliances between various States on either side, which were perpetually moving in and out of the war, each inconsistent in principle and in effect, each suddenly taking a hand in the fighting and suddenly making peace.

But the climax of the war was reached in 1648:

(a) At the battle of Zusmarshausen, May 17th, by the defeat of the Imperialists by Turenne and Wrangel (Marshal of Sweden).

(b) At the battle of Lens, August 20th, by the defeat of the Spaniards by Condé.

The result was the *Peace of Westphalia*, signed that same year on October 24th. Before coming to its provisions it is necessary to notice (1) that fear of France was already beginning to take the place hitherto held by fear of Spain in dictating the policy of European countries; thus, in January of 1648 the Dutch deliberately came to terms with the Spaniards under the Treaty of Munster, in order to prevent the Spanish Netherlands from falling into the hands of France. The Treaty of Westphalia showed that the menace of Spain, or the Empire, over Europe was ended; it made evident that Europe's new menace was France. Moreover, it is also necessary to notice (2) that France was herself suffering from her own domestic troubles, and was yet for some years intermittently subject to the ravages of civil war.

FRANCE

Ever since 1621 Richelieu had been behind the policy of Mary of Medici, advising her how to act in the Royal Council where she took a large share in the government of France; after 1624, when he became Minister (created Cardinal in 1622), he entered the Council himself and ruled France; in 1629 he was formally and openly promoted to be Chief Minister to France. His policy was directed abroad to an alliance with Holland and England, the leading Protestant Powers, and at home to the suppression of the Huguenots, whom he considered to be disloyal to the kingdom. Such a scheme, in which religiously his domestic policy contradicted his foreign policy, required the most careful handling; both parts of it afforded opportunities to the nobles, who considered themselves the official and natural councillors of the King, to intrigue against him and support his enemies in their own interests. But Richelieu was more than a match for them all; he broke the nobles (1626), he crushed the Huguenots (1628, 1629), and he brought England, even though it was aware of his treatment of the French Protestants, back into alliance (1629). By the subtle plot of the "day of dupes," in November 1630 (wherein he pretended to be dying) he discovered who were his friends and who his enemies, overthrew a conspiracy which he had long suspected, and secured his power more firmly than before. Gaston, the King's brother (but newly made Duke of Orleans), and Maria de Medici, who had both opposed him, fled into exile in the Spanish Netherlands. The plotting, however, went on. First, Guienne revolted and its privileges were withdrawn in 1637, then Normandy followed two years later and was similarly dealt with in 1639; the Cardinal was so much afraid of a general outbreak that in 1641 a royal declaration was promulgated, whereby all royal edicts were to be immediately sent to the Parlement of France to be registered. The next year he died, and a year later died Louis XIII.

The year 1643 saw the opening of the reign of Louis XIV (aged five) under the Regency of Anne of Austria, the Queen-Mother, with Cardinal Mazarin (Guilio Mazarini) as her Prime Minister, who had been trained for the post by Richelieu himself.

The Duke of Orleans made peace with the government and became Lieutenant-General of the kingdom and took over the command of one of the armies.

But the reckless extravagance with which the French wars were fought could only be sustained by heavy taxation, which roused the people everywhere to rebellion. So formidable were the peasant revolts of 1643 and 1644, and the conspiracy of the nobles, that Mazarin was forced to yield to their demands and reduce his heavy taxation. But eventually the Parlement was bullied into silence, and the Cardinal began to feel secure. In August 1648 the rising of the nobles (which had been intermittent throughout the long years of the government of the two Cardinals) grew to such strength that it reached a point of crisis and seemed to threaten the existence of the monarchy; it was partly the fear of what would come of this that made France come to terms with the Emperor and Spain, and with their allies and that forced it to sign the peace of Westphalia, though the terms were also certainly humiliating for the Hapsburgs.

RESULTS OF PEACE OF WESTPHALIA

By the Peace of Westphalia (October 24th, 1648) Austria and Spain were eliminated from Continental politics for a hundred years.

(i) The independence of the United Provinces of the Netherlands and of Switzerland was formally recognised by the Emperor; they no longer were to be considered part of the Empire. The United Provinces were to be allowed to treat their Catholic subjects as they wished. The Scheldt was closed to trade; from that time the importance of Antwerp (the port of the Spanish Netherlands) declined.

(ii) In Germany the year 1624 was taken as the final date of religious settlement; for whatever ecclesiastical establishments existed at the date of the signing of the treaty were to belong in perpetuity to the creed which then held them. Whatever public religious toleration then existed was to continue; but else only private worship was to be allowed. This meant that the North of Germany remained Protestant, but the whole of South

swung back to the Catholicism from which it had lately revolted.

(iii) The bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt went to Brandenburg, and the bishopric of Osnabrück was to be alternately Catholic and Protestant.³ (The Duke of Cumberland, who afterwards fought at Culloden, was one of the Protestant holders of the See, it having been given him by his father, George II, and he was in consequence styled *Son Altesse Reverendissime* in his official title. Of course he was never ordained or consecrated. A still later holder of the title of Bishop of Osnabrück was Frederick, Duke of York, who held the See from 1764 until 1803, when the anomalous arrangement was ended.) The Duke of Bavaria was given the Upper Palatinate, while the Lower Palatinate and its Electorship was given to Charles Lewis, the son of Frederick, the "Winter King"—thus the quarrel that started the Thirty Years' War was resolved, and the descendants of the protagonists, of Maximilian of Bavaria and of the Elector Frederick, each secured a vote in the electoral college. The number of Electors was, therefore, now raised to eight.

(iv) Sweden, by receiving the Duchy of Western Pomerania, the bishoprics of Bremen and Verden, and the towns of Stettin and Wismar, now held in virtue of these possessions a position in the German System.

(v) The Duchy of Eastern Pomerania went to Brandenburg; by this the Hohenzollern had already begun his move upward at the expense of Austria, his ally.

(vi) France gained all Alsace, Breisach, and the cities of Metz, Toul and Verdun, and a guarantee that no fortresses were to be erected on the right bank of the Danube from Basel to Philipsburg. Furthermore, though France did not possess, as Sweden did, a position in the Empire, she was given certain rights of interference in its affairs. In any event she was sure to exercise these powers if she could, whether they were hers by law or no.

(vii) Lastly, Germany, as a whole, was now to receive its freedom from the Emperor; each prince was to be recognised as a sovereign with powers of treaty-making (the validity of

which depended upon the sole approval of the prince and did not need Imperial confirmation), of forming alliances, and of making war. This crippled the Empire, gave Prussia (under France's protection) its freedom to start out on its political adventure, and secured for France a military supremacy in Europe that lasted almost till Waterloo, except for the interlude of the victories of Frederick the Great and of the English victories in conjunction with William of Orange and, later, over the French Colonials in India and in the Americas.

THE FRONDE AND THE SPANISH WAR

Hardly had the treaty been signed than the Twelve Weeks War of the Fronde (or revolting nobles) began; the French Court fled from Paris in January 1649, but returned on April 1st with the fighting done. Next year the Princes again rebelled, Condé leading them, while Turenne on his own responsibility made peace with Spain (which had not been included in the Peace of Westphalia); and then followed another period of conflict, in which Condé was continuously in rebellion against the Crown, the Queen continuously in alliance with the younger Fronde, which no longer accepted Condé as its leader or even the old ideas of the earlier Fronde, Turenne continuously in command of the royal armies and Mazarin of the royal policy. Occasionally Mazarin, however, was in flight, as from time to time public opinion showed itself violently opposed to him.

Meanwhile (apart from Turenne's personal action) the Franco-Spanish War continued.

In 1652, on October 21st, Louis XIV entered Paris, recalled Mazarin, exiled the chiefs of the Fronde and forced the Parliament again to relinquish its claims to political power; in 1654 Louis XIV was crowned at Rheims; in 1655 a close political alliance was made at Westminster between Cromwell and the French, which was renewed at Paris in 1657, and was followed by sending of English troops to the Lower Netherlands to help against Spain. In 1660 Condé was reconciled to the King, and Duke Gaston of Orleans died and Philip—Louis' brother—was created Duke of Orleans in his place, and founded the new House

of Orleans and married Henrietta, the sister of Charles II; in 1661 Mazarin died, and Louis XIV became King in full exercise of his powers.

Meanwhile, in 1659, the Peace of the Pyrenees on November 7th ended the war between France and Spain, which had not by any means gone uniformly in France's favour, for the sword of Condé (since 1651) had been in Spanish service, and Turenne had more than once been driven back by his old colleague; even some of the cities of France had changed hands during the contest, and the province of Flanders had been in perpetual turmoil, Gravelines and Dunkirk suffering by the long drawn out warfare.

ENGLAND AND HOLLAND

The exiles from England and Ireland who were driven out of their countries because of their attachment to their Catholic religion, and who were living abroad because of their desire to enter religious life, or who were sent oversea to be educated in Catholic schools, were settled in these very towns round which most of the fighting had turned. Their annals are full of the continued disturbance that these battles and sieges provoked in the whole countryside; they lived under the perpetual menace and uncertainties of war.

Thus Dunkirk in 1658 fell into English hands; for an English army had been sent over, since, under the terms of the Treaty of Paris in 1657, Cromwell had undertaken to provide English troops for the alliance. The exiled communities there found themselves once more under the English flag. Indeed, even after Spain and France had made peace, England still continued at war with Spain, till May 1667, when Charles II, once more back in England, had been on the throne for seven years. It was during this war with Spain that Blake twice destroyed the Spanish fleet—in 1656 and in 1657; he had himself been defeated by the Dutch admiral, Van Tromp, in 1652.

That religion had now ceased to be a motive for political alliances and antagonism in European politics was evident when, in 1652, England went to war with Holland, both of them by this time republics—the Commonwealth had been proclaimed in

England on May 19th, 1649, and Holland since its independence had always been a republic (William II of Holland had died in 1650, leaving only a posthumous child, the son of Princess Mary of England, the sister of Charles II. In this tiny representative even the power of the Stadtholdership was now under eclipse). The causes of the dispute were:

(i) The Navigation Act of 1651, which prohibited:

(a) The importation into England of non-European goods except in English or colonial vessels.

(b) The importation of European goods into England except in English ships or ships belonging to the country that had produced the goods.

(ii) The demand of England to have the "right of search" over all vessels which were suspected of carrying contraband to countries with which she was at war.

The fight between the two republics consisted in a series of sea-battles, in which the success of the English, in spite of many individual defeats, was so considerable that Oliver Cromwell was able to dictate his terms to John de Witt, Grand Pensionary of Holland, in April 1654:

(i) The Dutch were to salute the British flag in British waters.

(ii) They were to pay compensation for the massacre of the English traders at Amboyne.

(iii) They were to accept the Navigation Act in its substantial features.

(iv) They were to exclude the Prince of Orange from any position of authority in their State.

On the strength of this peace, England, Holland, Sweden, Denmark and Portugal concluded a joint alliance, to protect each other's interests in the general war that was still raging between the House of Bourbon and the two branches of the House of Hapsburg in the Empire and Spain. Eventually this alliance put itself on the side of France and helped her to compel the new Emperor, Leopold I (1658-1705), to sign the *Treaty of the Pyrenees* (November 7th, 1659).

By it:

(i) France gained territory to the N.E. in Lower Flanders,

Artois, and several fortresses in Flanders and Hainault (including Lille, St. Omer, Valenciennes and Sedan), Rousillion and Cerdagne, and the Duchy of Bar.

(ii) Lorraine was to be restored to its Duke, Charles IV, by France, which had occupied it since 1635.

(iii) Spain surrendered all claims to Alsace.

(iv) Condé was to be restored by the French to his governorship in Burgundy and given a complete amnesty.

NORTHERN EUROPE

But all this while in the north of Europe and to the north-east of it another war continuously waged. Sigismund of Poland (1587-1632), who had succeeded by inheritance to Sweden and then been expelled from it, was followed on his Polish throne by Ladislaus VII (1632), and at his death by John Casimir, in the year of the Peace of Westphalia, 1648. He had difficulties at once:

(i) The Cossacks of *South Lithuania* revolted, defeated the Poles, and put themselves under the Tsar of Russia in 1648; the Poles, therefore, declared war on Russia.

(ii) The *Swedes* under Charles X (who succeeded on the abdication of his cousin, Christina, in 1654) renewed their old war with Poland,

(a) partly because it was a traditional war and Charles X wanted to fight someone.

(b) Partly because he hoped thus to distract his turbulent nobles from their rising opposition to the Crown.

(c) Partly because he was afraid of the Russians in Livonia, who were pressing hard on the Poles, and he wanted to secure territory there before the Russians could get it. He wished to forestall the "mailed fist" of the Tsar.

After very little fighting the Swedes gained a victory over John Casimir, on August 23rd (1655), and followed it up by the capture of Warsaw on August 30th and of Cracow on October 8th. But two years later the Poles revolted and forced Charles X to call in Brandenburg to his aid; and Brandenburg used the opportunity, without troubling to consider either principle or policy, to secure

complete political control of Eastern Pomerania (the suzerainty of which had been given it in the Treaty of Westphalia) and thus to get a wider stretch of territory to the east and south.

In all these struggles Poland was hampered by a constitution in which the kingship was at least nominally elective (a weakening influence), but also in which a strange contradictory system obtained, whereby:

(a) By the *liberum veto* any noble could object to any measure proposed in the Diet and could block its introduction.

(b) Any group of nobles could "make a confederation" which gave them at once a legislative authority and prevented the use of the *liberum veto*.

This gave the nobles an opportunity to enforce irresistibly their demands on the monarchy, to secure privileges for themselves and, if need were, to intrigue with neighbouring foreign Powers.

But the war was not confined to Poland, Sweden and Russia, for Denmark took the opportunity to attack Sweden (1657) and England intervened with Holland, to compel Sweden and Denmark to make peace (1659); finally, in 1660, Charles X of Sweden died. A series of treaties were now concluded one after another, which rearranged the political ownership of the provinces in the Baltic, for Russia had taken the opportunity of the Polish-Swedish war to invade Swedish territory on its own border, and had overrun Ingria, Karelia and Finland. These wars then were now ended with a series of treaties:

1660—The Treaty of Oliva between Poland and Brandenburg.

1660—The Treaty of Copenhagen between Sweden and Denmark.

1661—The Treaty of Kardis between Sweden and Russia.

1667—The Treaty of Andruszowo between Poland and Russia.
By these treaties:

(i) The Polish king abandoned all claims to the Swedish throne.

(ii) Livonia was taken over by Sweden.

(iii) The eastern part of the Ukraine, as well as Kiev, was given to Russia.

(iv) The Sound was freed from Danish tolls and Sweden took possession of all Danish territory to the east of the Sound.

Thus Sweden, Brandenburg and Russia had all gained at Poland's expense.

COLONIAL EXPANSION

But these incessant wars for aggrandisement in Europe, involving France, Spain, Portugal, England and Holland, were not confined to the European possessions of these countries, but spread to their colonial possessions. Thus, Portugal, which had done so much to open up the new world during the age of discovery, and Holland, which, since its independence, had developed its sea power, largely for purposes of trade, were now in frequent collision:

In 1651 the Dutch set out for, and in 1652 (under Van Riebeck) took possession of, the Cape of Good Hope, capturing it from the Portuguese.

In 1656 they attacked the colonial territories of Portugal everywhere.

In 1663 they captured all the Portuguese colonies in India, except Goa and Diu.

A. Moreover, the *Dutch* were busy creating for themselves a commercial empire overseas. Between 1620 and 1630 they had founded at the mouth of the Hudson river a colony called the New Netherlands, and built as its capital the trading city of New Amsterdam; in 1655 they captured the Swedish settlement on the Delaware River which had been founded in 1632. They then pushed their way down into the West Indian islands in order to obtain a share of the growing trade in the sugar cane.

B. The *French* also had taken a great interest in colonial enterprise; their work in North America was done chiefly through their missionaries:

In 1608, Champlain founded Quebec and discovered in 1609 the lake that now bears his name.

In 1612, the French Jesuit missionaries, by royal command, took over part of the Franciscan districts of Canada and began to push forward their discoveries to the west and south.

In 1674, Marquette and Jolliet, both Jesuits, sailed down the Mississippi almost to its mouth, taking possession of the country in the name of France.

In 1681-2, Robert La Salle, another Jesuit, completed the navigation of the Mississippi.

The French had also established commercial bases in Madagascar and India.

C. The *English* colonies, too, date from this "Second age of discovery," when men went no longer to explore in order to hold or to convert souls to Christianity, but in order to secure a monopoly of trade.

In 1606, two Virginian companies obtained charters from James I and established the first English colony in America in 1607.

In 1620, the *Mayflower* sailed with its English exiles, who had been taking shelter in Holland from the persecution of the Established Church of England; they founded New Plymouth, and were eventually, in 1692, incorporated in Massachusetts.

In 1624, the British East India Company began to build its factories in India. This move was partly due to the monopoly in pepper established by the Dutch, who raised the price per pound from 2s. 8d. to 8s. The London grocers founded the company which soon brought the price of pepper down to 2s. a pound and then proceeded to conquer India.

In 1629-40, the Puritans sailed West from England and founded Boston and the Massachusetts Colony; and then, because schisms rent them amongst themselves, and each dominant sect persecuted its rivals, they swarmed into Connecticut, New Hampshire and Rhode Island. These were founded as refuges by the religious dissenters who were driven out from their original colonies for adopting new and unpopular beliefs.

In 1633, George Calvert, Lord Baltimore, secured leave for the founding of a Catholic settlement in a district which he called Maryland.

In 1640, Madras was founded.

In 1661, Charles II obtained Bombay as part of his wife's dowry, and gave it to the East India Company.

In 1663, the two Carolinas were established.

In 1670, the Hudson Bay Company got its charter.

In 1681, William Penn was given a large district on the Delaware river which eventually became known as Pennsylvania.

In 1690, the settlement of the English at Calcutta began.

THE UNREST IN EUROPE

But in all these troublesome wars of settlement and rivalry between the various powers on the continent of Europe, both at home and abroad in their colonial possessions, with their selfish political objects and their complete lack of principle, or even of any pretence of legal justification, certain factors emerged and certain inevitable conclusions forced themselves on the minds of the monarchs and their prime ministers:

(i) It was evident that everywhere the nobles were making efforts to prevent themselves being overwhelmed by the new national monarchies.

(ii) Everywhere, on the other hand, the commercial classes were seeking to identify themselves with strong governments so long as those governments did not threaten them with taxation.

(iii) Some of the confused warfare was due to a lack of natural boundaries between the European States, or of any definite scheme by which the map of Europe might become permanently fixed.

(iv) The complete political collapse of the Papacy and its inability to give any public expression to its temporal influence on the world-politics of Christendom, withdrew from Europe any consistent unity or centre.

(v) Europe's great danger lay in any weakly-governed nation, for the desire of the neighbours of any such nation was to filch away its provinces, partly out of greed and partly out of self-protection, and therefore to create a state of war.

(vi) The spread of anarchy seemed largely due to the sectarian spirit of Protestantism, which had been cradled in revolt, and which could never accept in peace the supremacy over it, not only of any Catholic government, but of any govern-

ment the religious tenets of which were not of the exact nature of its own.

While religion was no longer a cause of war between separate nations, it had in no wise decreased as a cause of revolts, revolutions and anarchy. In time this rebellious character of religion became the new basis of civil toleration; because (i) it was difficult to impose religion on anyone or to hold him to it; (ii) it seemed impossible even to hope again for a unity of Christendom; (iii) it was evidently beyond the wit of man to devise a religion that would suit everybody, despite the later efforts made in favour of "comprehensiveness," so that in despair governments were forced to grant toleration everywhere, in order to secure civil tranquillity. The dream of Montaigne and his friends was coming true. But *Montaigne* (1533-1592), while he urged tolerance on the French monarchy, was perfectly aware, in a way that shocked even his wide and almost irreligious mind, of the terrible effects of Protestantism; he had been revolted by its coarse disregard for Catholic sanctities, its blatant attitude to immemorial traditions, its cocksure impertinence towards the venerable and quiet stream of human culture, as though the individual judgment of the ill-educated was worth asserting against the mature judgment of mankind. While he was gentle enough to ignorance or lack of information, he had little respect for mere learning; he could see culture and true education of mind in the peasants of the "mountain" whence he took his name, in the repose of their labour, in the spirit engendered by the peach-blossom and the fragrance of the land; what he spoke of with distress (for his essays are really conversations preserved fresh and living) was the new revolutionary spirit of immature swaggering minds. He had, indeed, desired that they should be left alone and not compelled to conform to Catholicism; but he prophesied that the spirit of the new religion was destructive of all that was worth preserving in the world.

Just one hundred years later (in 1656) *Pascal* wrote his *Provincial Letters* against the extreme casuistry of his day. The cycle had turned completely. The principles of Montaigne had been abused. There were too many theologians at that time, who, in their

eagerness to hold all classes and types to the Faith and preserve them from straying from it, were bent on making morality easy for the sinner and thus strained the moral principles of the Church to justify every aberration of man. So evidently unhealthy was the frame of mind engendered by this, and so widespread the immorality which it was used to justify, that the French mind passed to the other extreme and invented *Jansenism*, a severely puritanical religion based on the *Augustinus* of Jansenius (b. 1585) Bishop of Ypres. After Jansenius' death (1638), the book was sent to Rome for judgment, and five propositions were extracted from it and condemned by Innocent X in 1653; thus opened this long quarrel of religion which affected and divided the best and most austere minds in France.

Commendable where it attacked the extreme casuists, Jansenism was yet in its own teaching narrow; and in its efforts to prove that Rome's condemnation did not really affect it, it was as given over to quibbling as its opponents had been. But it is important to see it as part of that general anarchy of religion and of public thinking that was, with ever-widening cleavage, breaking up the common unity of Europe. Individuality was no longer considered to be compatible with a common brotherhood; private judgment had been made into an idol, the worship of which threatened to destroy the sanity of any real democracy. An exaggeration of the old doctrine of the value of the human personality into a development of the self, meant not only a break with the past, but with the present; it meant isolation and dissolution; it seemed to some at that period to portend the collapse of the world.

Grotius (1585-1645) wrote in 1625 his *De jure belli ac pacis*, after a close study of the Spanish theologians who had themselves been pioneers in applying the principles of Christian morality to the political and civil relations of state with state. This great work popularised the teaching of the theologians and built on the foundations which they had laid its theories and proposals for the edifice of a new international law. The object of *Grotius* was to find a new conscious bond of unity between the vigorously individualistic nations; since they were now permanently divided

by religion, he tried to unite them by law. A community of faith seemed no longer possible; he tried a community of legal principles. To establish this he went back to Roman law. Luther had burnt the *Corpus juris*; Grotius deliberately brought it back. The temper of his mind was fine and precise: he imagined states as fellow-citizens in an ampler dominion of Rome.

Here, then, was a cure for the Protestant disruption, proposed by one who had suffered under the aftermath of the Reformation and the anarchy of the Thirty Years' War. But Grotius found little sympathy for his scheme even amongst his own people.

THE POLICY OF ABSOLUTISM

Another solution to the problem of the growing anarchy presented itself to the monarchs of the time, to Louis XIV especially, namely, an absolute monarchy, with an efficient centralisation at home and a victorious army abroad. By this means Louis judged that he could give the world peace. The Stuarts had always had the same conception of their own dynastic mission: but Charles II, partly from indolence and partly from his frank recognition of his actual political and financial dependence on his people or on the French king, had in the practice given up any attempt to carry it out.

In Holland, *William III* would have done the same as Louis did, had he been able. The revolution that got rid of the De Witts (John the Grand Pensionary and Cornelius his chief lieutenant), gave him at first some hope of success in establishing a monarchy. He had also some success in his armed interventions in the French war which Louis' ambition had provoked. But the peace of Niemegen (1678-1679) destroyed his hopes for the moment, and his subsequent election as King of England was of little help to him in establishing in either country the dictatorship he desired. The "glorious revolution" of 1688 was certainly not a revolution intended to benefit the monarchy, but the great nobles. It was not at all an absolute monarchy, but an unfettered oligarchy, that the Whigs had desired to establish on the ruined policy of the dismissed Stuarts. William had been brought in largely because he was a foreigner and would be at a disadvantage

in England, and because the nobles feared the power of the Crown. The party of the Protestant succession twice over preferred to subject England to an alien prince (to a Dutchman and to a Hanoverian), because it was afraid that a native prince might throw in his lot with the people, and the nobles might be ground between these upper and nether stones of the political mill.

LOUIS XIV

The policy of absolutism was a common plan, then, of the monarchs of the day; but it so very nearly succeeded in the case of Louis XIV that it was in France at last that not unnaturally the alternatives most openly faced each other, absolutism and its most violent reaction, autocracy and the revolution. At the end of this period in France the revolution seemed to win.

But at first the general policy of Louis XIV dominated completely at home every department of the national life.

A. In *religion* his scheme included both the Catholics and the Protestants. He dealt first with the Catholics. Here his plan was, as far as he could, to isolate them from the Papacy. He had two means of doing it:

(a) In practice: in 1673, Louis XIV began to use as a general right the revenues of vacant sees and to claim the appointment of the bishops.

(b) In theory: in 1681, he obtained the Declaration of the Four Articles (or Four Gallican Propositions) from an assembly of the French clergy, namely that:

(i) the Pope's authority only had reference to spiritual matters.

(ii) the authority of the General Councils was superior to the authority of the Pope.

(iii) the Gallican Church was independent of the Pope in its organisation and elections;

(iv) the doctrinal teaching of the Pope was not authoritative until it had been accepted by the Church.

Further, the King saw to it that this Declaration should be afterwards sanctioned by the Sorbonne (the theological

faculty of the Paris University) and by many provincial Parlements.

B. Then in 1685 he proceeded to deal with industry as it was carried on by the Protestants, by *revoking the Edict of Nantes* granted them by Henry IV. As a result of this revocation the majority of the Huguenots withdrew:

(i) to the south and east coast of England and to London.

(ii) to the Netherlands as, for instance, the Duke of Schomberg, who took service with William of Orange and was killed at the battle of the Boyne;

(iii) to Brandenburg, where the Grand Elector gave them waste lands to cultivate;

(iv) to the Dutch settlements in South Africa, where they mixed easily with the Calvinistic colonists of that agricultural community and helped to constitute what were called the Boers.

C. Already Louis had managed to include civil functions as well as religious under his dictatorship, and in the very year in which he seized on the revenues of vacant benefices he began to coerce the *Parlement of Paris* and to deprive it of all political power. In February of 1673 he issued an edict suppressing its right to make remonstrances before registering royal edicts. He would only allow it to be a registration committee, with no power to modify, protest against, or even debate, royal measures promulgated to it. Louis XIV kept it sternly to this interpretation of its duties and insisted on its registering his decrees, especially when he knew it was vitally opposed to them. He would allow it no "parliamentary" rights or privileges.

D. This royal and personal autocracy of Louis XIV was applied to everything. It included a patronage of the *arts and sciences* of France. He was saluted as the *Great Monarch* and *King Sun*, the brightness that fertilised and enlightened the earth. This view of his duties as king had its effect on the inspiration of the great men who dignified the name of France during his reign. In every direction there was a recrudescence of the traditions of

Imperial Rome. All the forms of the classic arts were deliberately imitated, and something of the grand style of the classic Latin literature was caught in the prose, poetry, and architecture, and even in the fashions of life of the period of Louis Quatorze. Since then French habits of mind have been so formed by it that they have never been far apart from the old models of the great days of the Roman Republic. This result has been due to a policy deliberately fostered by Louis XIV, as much out of idealism as out of pride.

E. Even the *nobles* were encouraged to ape the magnificence of the Court, in the hope that this would limit their ambitions and make them anxious to shine merely in the royal circles. The policy was successful. There were no Whig nobles left in France when Louis XIV finished his reign; there were only courtiers who grew bankrupt in their efforts to follow and emulate the splendours of the king.

F. While at home, Louis gathered into his hands all the threads of government (Colbert, his Minister, best serving him with constancy, industry and genius), he was able *abroad* to make himself the centre of the politics of Europe. His victories and defeats alternated, but through them all Louis XIV moved predominant. He was the axle round which revolved the monarchs and monarchies of his day. The others changed their plans, their alliances, and their strategy; Louis kept calmly on, with his fixed designs for the future of the House of Bourbon, and his steady purpose to be in effect, and it might be one day in name, the Emperor of the West.

WARS IN EASTERN EUROPE

There were, indeed, other wars in Europe besides his wars; for instance, there were the wars between Austria and the Turks, though even in this Louis XIV was appealed to by Austria for aid. But the victory of St. Gotthard in 1664 was an Imperialist victory, and it ended for a while the renewed activity of the Turks in Hungary.

Again, there was a Polish war against the invading Turks, which followed on the abdication of King John Casimir and his

retirement into a monastery in 1668. In his place as king, the Poles chose Michael of Lithuania, who was succeeded in 1673 by his general, John Sobieski. During Michael's reign (1669-1673) the Turks over-ran most of Poland; an alliance was then formed between them and the Magyars in Hungary, who were seeking to throw off the Imperial rule which had for many years been recognised under the name of the Royal Government of Hungary. A dozen years later, seizing an unexpected opportunity, the two allies (Hungarians and Turks) marched suddenly on Vienna in 1683, and with the panic which this movement produced very nearly got immediate possession of the city. However, though checked at the beginning, the allied armies settled down to besiege it, confident in their success. Meanwhile, however, before the enemy had advanced thus far, Sobieski, who had formed a defensive alliance with the Emperor, joined forces with the Austrians and fell on the invaders, defeated them at Lemberg (1675), and drove them from the city. But his victory proved barren of results, and he was obliged to make peace with Turkey almost on her terms. But in 1683 Sobieski made his historic march to the defence of Vienna and crushed the Turks outside its walls. Seeing which was now the winning side, Venice (which had lost Crete to the Turks in 1669) joined the new alliance under the instigation of the Holy See, and together with Austria and Poland attacked the whole European front of the Turkish positions (1684).

Buda, which had been in Turkish hands for a century and a half, was recaptured in 1686; and in the next year, at the second battle of Mohacz (in which the early defeat of the Christians was amply avenged), the Turks were completely routed.

Thus, Poland was now wholly freed from the Turks; in 1690, Venice reconquered the Morea; in 1696, Peter the Great of Russia joined the Holy League, as it was called, and captured Azov at the mouth of the Don; in 1697, Prince Eugene of Savoy, the Imperial general, again defeated the Turks at Zeuta. Peace was eventually made (1699—the peace of Carlowitz) which confirmed these victories, giving Hungary and the suzerainty of Transylvania to Austria, Podolia to Poland, the Morea to Venice, and Azov, its first seaport, to Russia.

THE NEW MOTIVE FOR WARS

But, apart from this Eastern fighting, during the whole of the reigns of Louis XIV and Louis XV the politics of Europe revolved round France, chiefly because of the ambitious projects of her kings to dominate the Western world. The chief Powers of Europe at this time, other than France, were, of course, Austria, with its bundle of provinces personally united to the head of the House of Hapsburg, further north the Electors of Bavaria, Saxony and Brandenburg, beyond these the perpetually opposing Powers of Sweden and Denmark, with Russia now growing in importance under the energetic direction of Peter the Great; then further to the west, the Netherlands and Great Britain (a single kingdom after 1707), and below these, Spain.

Religion, though occasionally forcing countries into alliance almost against their will, was no longer of the political importance it had been earlier; *rivalry in trade* had become the new dividing principle which drove the Protestant governments of England and Holland into rivalry, and united in a common interest at one time the English and the French, or at another, the English and the Russians against the French. Since there was no definite principle governing European politics, except a common dislike for any dominating Power, and not as yet any international law such as Hugo Grotius had proved to be necessary, the changes of alliance during this century and a half were endless and bewildering; but this was not really due to mere chance nor hardly at all to the altered policies of successive prime ministers, but to shifting trade interests.

For example, the marriage of Charles II to Catherine of Braganza (1662) brought to England as her dowry the town and island of Bombay; but in the neighbourhood of Bombay were Dutch trading settlements. Consequently the two sets of rival commercial adventurers were soon at loggerheads in India, and the result was a world-wide war between England and Holland. At home the Dutch were on the whole victorious; in North America the English captured the Dutch Settlement of the New Netherlands (1664) and refounded it as "the colonies" of New Jersey and New York. But the success of the Dutch at home and

their triumphant appearance in the Thames and the Medway (1667), burning the shipping, and striking terror into the hearts of the Londoners—as Pepys' diary graphically described it—forced peace on the reluctant Charles II, though in the Treaty of London (1674) the American conquests of the English were recognised by the Dutch.

WAR OF THE SPANISH SUCCESSION

But the first cause of the next general European war was due to the desire of France to secure the best results from the expected death without issue of Charles II of Spain. The first stage lasted from 1668-1713. It began with secret negotiations between Louis and the Emperor, as a result of which the two monarchs agreed to divide the heritage between them, France taking Flanders, the Italian possessions of the Spanish monarchy, and those in Africa and in the Philippines, while Austria was to have Spain and the rest of its colonial territories. In the event of possible hostilities Louis then proceeded to make treaties with Spain, Bavaria, Sweden, and England; and shortly after with various of the German princes. But the first aggressive movement came from Holland, which, having already come to terms with Spain, declared war on Louis; at sea the Dutch were, as usual, victorious, but on land they were so hard pressed by the invading French armies, that William of Orange opened the sluices of the dykes and drowned the country to save Amsterdam (1672). Meanwhile, the Emperor, grown afraid of the military strength of France, headed an alliance against Louis, which continued for some time to collect the support of various princes and kings.

But in 1678 and 1679 peace was made between France and Holland, Spain and the Empire; yet, for all that, the fighting still went on, for France was determined to hold the Jura and the left bank of the Rhine as her boundaries, and to re-establish Sweden in her strength. When peace had, however, at last been effectually established, Louis XIV tried to stir up discontent amongst the subjects of his late enemies, not without some success. As, however, this was not sufficiently effective, Louis began again to fall back on his policy of war, this time on every frontier, against

Spain, the Empire, Holland, England (now, 1689, ruled by William III), the Palatinate, Savoy, etc., and made war not only on European soil, but carried it over to the Americas. Ireland also was invaded in 1690 by Lauzun, but the battle of the Boyne (July 1st, 1690) destroyed his hopes there. At last, after considerable fighting on every side, the Congress of Ryswick opened in 1697 to settle the differences between France and the coalition against her, England, Holland, Spain and the Empire; when these had been settled, France proposed immediately to England and the Emperor a partition treaty which was to settle finally the fate of Spain. The first proposal of 1668 was altered in 1700 in such a way as to divide the Spanish territories between the Archduke Charles (nephew of Charles II of Spain and son of Leopold I by Margaret Theresa, Charles II's sister) and the Dauphin, Louis, and to give to the Archduke, Spain, the Spanish Netherlands and the Spanish possessions overseas, and to the Dauphin the Italian territories of Spain.


Almost immediately this had been agreed to Charles II died (November 1700), leaving his whole dominions to Philip, Duke of Anjou, the Dauphin's son and Louis XIV's grandson (Philip V). Louis at once repudiated his partition treaties and accepted the bequest; the rest of Europe, terrified at this immense accession of territory to France and of the power it would bring, promptly opposed the will; the war that followed was called in consequence the War of the Spanish Succession (1702-1713).^{*} It was fought on the allied side by Marlborough and Prince Eugene, and on the side of France by Vendome and Villars. The war can be broken up into all manner of campaigns.

There were isolated expeditions like that of Lord Peterborough to Spain, in 1706; there were great campaigns like that rendered brilliant by the skilful strategy of Marlborough in the battles of Blenheim (1704), Ramillies (1706), Oudenarde (1708), and Malplaquet (1709); there were sudden changes of plan, as when

^{*}The allied nations did not resist the succession of Philip V to the throne of Spain but demanded a guarantee from Louis XIV that Philip should not succeed also to the French throne. Louis refused to guarantee that the two crowns should not be worn by the same king. This was the cause of the fear that began the war.

AS
EFFECTED BY THE TREATIES OF
UTRECHT & RASTADT
1713 - 1714

Austria —



in 1707 Louis XIV evacuated Italy and lost the Italian territories irretrievably to the Spanish Crown, or when the Spanish Netherlands (1708) declared for France and admitted French troops into their garrisons; there were subsidiary wars like those fought by Sweden (1709) against the Confederacy of the North, Russia, Prussia, Denmark and Saxony; there were the victim States, like Poland, whose sovereign was unseated (1704) and re-established (1709) by foreign Powers; there were colonial wars in Canada, Mauritius and India; but after these ten years of fighting, at last in 1712 the Congress of Utrecht opened. Meanwhile the Dauphin had died in 1711, the Dauphin's son, Louis, Duke of Burgundy, in 1712, and Leopold I, the Emperor, in 1705; the Archduke Charles had now been elected Emperor. Moreover, it now looked as though France herself might be troubled with a war of succession, for Louis XIV was ageing, and his heir was only a little child, his great-grandson. Notice that France had excluded Austria from the Utrecht treaties (1714), which were made only with the other allied Powers.

The principal items of the treaties were:

(i) A barrier of fortresses to be established between France and Holland.

(ii) The Spanish Netherlands to belong to Austria.

(iii) France to regain Lille, Bethune, etc., and, abroad, Cape Breton with its fisheries.

(iv) The Duke of Savoy to have Sicily (with the title of king), Savoy and Nice.

(v) The Grand Elector to be King of Prussia, and to have Upper Guelderland and Neuchatel.

(vi) Portugal to have the colony of San Sacramento, North of River Plate.

(vii) England to have Newfoundland, Hudson's Bay, Gibraltar and Minorca, to receive the *asiento* from Spain (i.e., the right to import 4,800 negroes a year into America for thirty years and of sending once a year a ship of five hundred tons to Portobello), and its settlement of the Protestant succession to the Crown

recognised by France. This meant a repudiation by Louis of the House of Stuart.

Eventually peace was made also between France and the Empire, whereby France gave back her conquests on the right bank of the Rhine, but retained Alsace and Strasburg.

These seemed such inconsiderable gains for France after all her fighting, that since Louis XIV died the next year (1715), the end of his reign was clouded with the shadows of disappointment. That year also saw the failure of the Jacobite rising in Scotland, due largely to the absence of French support, and in Spain the rising influence of Elizabeth Farnese (wife of Philip V) and her hostility to the political ideas of France.

NORTHERN EUROPE

Meanwhile, there was continual fighting in the North, where Peter the Great of Russia, Frederick IV of Denmark, George I of Hanover and England, Frederick William I of Prussia, and Augustus II of Poland carried on campaigns against Charles XII of Sweden, the traditional ally of France. The chief battle was at Pultova (July 8th, 1709), in which Charles was defeated. Up till then he had secured general success, even against so formidable a band of opponents. Their mutual jealousies were his best defence, and enabled him to attack each in turn. Cardinal Alberoni, now (1717) the chief minister of Spain, intervened in the hope of reconciling Charles and Peter the Great, at first to no purpose: but a series of treaties were eventually concluded between all the countries involved in the war (1720-1721) which gave Pomerania and Stettin to Prussia, Schleswig to Denmark, Livonia, Esthonia, Ingria and parts of Karelia and of Finland to Russia, and Bremen and Verden to Hanover. Most of Finland remained to Sweden.

NATIONAL REGROUPINGS

About this time two sets of treaties were made which were hostile to the late politics of Europe and went back to the earlier grouping of the nations immediately after the Reformation. It

will be noticed, however, that these various alliances were never stable:

1717, a triple alliance between France, England and Holland (yet in 1718 it was joined by the Emperor Charles VI and called the Quadruple Alliance).

1725, Treaty of Vienna between Austria and Spain (April), followed by another treaty (of Hanover or Herrenhausen, September) deliberately entered into by Holland, England and Prussia to oppose the Treaty of Vienna. Yet, to show how impossible it is to follow the inconsistent and devious political schemes of this period, note that:

(i) In 1720, Spain joined the Quadruple Alliance.

(ii) In 1721, a defensive alliance was made between France, Spain and England.

(iii) In 1726, an alliance was formed between Austria and the Palatinate, in which Austria guaranteed Jülich and Berg to the Elector,

(iv) And in the same year another alliance was made between Austria and Prussia, in which Austria guaranteed them to Prussia.


But many of these alliances existed only on paper; the actual alliances that counted were those between Austria and Russia in 1726, between Austria and Prussia in 1728, and between France and Spain in 1729; they were put to the test on the death of Augustus I of Saxony and II of Poland (1733). A disputed election followed, the rival candidates being Stanislaus Leszczynski, father-in-law to Louis XV (who had ruled Poland after the deposition of Augustus by Louis XIV in 1704), and Augustus III, the son of Augustus II. After some fighting, France agreed, in 1735, to the succession of Augustus III, and compensated Stanislaus with the Duchy of Lorraine during his lifetime, with the proviso that it was to revert to France at his death (it had been occupied by France for many years, but was legally not French territory), while the dispossessed Duke of Lorraine received as his compensation the promise of the Duchies of Bar and Tuscany on the death of the Grand Duke. (The last named died in 1737, the last of the Medici.) Stanislaus held his duchy till 1766.

In 1739 England declared war against Spain—"the war of Jenkins' ear"; it was forced on Walpole by a war-fever in England, deliberately worked up by Walpole's political opponents on the wholly false plea that Captain Jenkins had been badly treated by the Spanish authorities and had had his ear cut off by them. The whole story was baseless. But it produced war, and "Rule Britannia." In 1742 Walpole resigned and Carteret became the pre-dominating force in the Cabinet. The English policy now turned to an alliance between England, Austria and Prussia (ruled by Frederick the Great, who had succeeded his father in 1740; he had been imprisoned by his father in 1730 and his bosom friend Katte executed, in order that the due discipline of the new spirit of Prussia might form him to its required harshness; his father's training had its lifelong effect).

WAR OF THE AUSTRIAN SUCCESSION

But Austria had already been invaded by Frederick the Great in 1740, who saw the approaching menace of another disputed succession, this time in Austria, on the death of Charles VI, and was anxious to have a share in the inevitable spoils. He captured Lower Silesia, Brieg, Breslau, Glatz and Olmütz in 1741. The next year Charles VI died. Maria Theresa, his elder daughter, had married Francis of Lorraine, Tuscany, and Bar, the son of Leopold Charles, Duke of Lorraine, and by the terms of the Pragmatic Sanction (the name given to the will of Charles VI promulgated in 1718, which had been guaranteed already by France and the chief European States) she now succeeded to her father's hereditary estates and hoped that her husband would in consequence be elected Emperor; however, there were immediately three dissentients to this course: (a) Frederick the Great, who had claimed Silesia as part of the heritage of the Hohenzollerns; and (b) two Imperial claimants, Charles Albert Duke of Bavaria, the husband of Maria Amelia, daughter of Joseph I, elder brother and predecessor of Charles VI; and (c) Augustus II of Poland (August III of Saxony), who was married to another daughter of Joseph I, Maria Josepha. This genealogical tree will show the relationship of the disputants:

Leopold I: 1658-1705



In the end, Charles of Bavaria succeeded to the Empire, 1742-1745, as Charles VII, and after him Francis of Lorraine, 1745-1765, as Francis I.

But the action of Frederick of Prussia in invading Silesia (December 16th) immediately after the death of Charles VI (October 20th), had been carefully protected by an alliance with France, which also had designs on the German territories of Austria. George II of England, however, already at war with Spain and knowing that France was bound by treaty to assist Spain, felt himself compelled to support Maria Theresa as his only available ally; and, though he had no quarrel with Prussia, still, as Elector of Hanover, he disliked the increased power of Frederick the Great which Silesia (and whatever else might be picked up out of a scramble for the dominions of Maria Theresa) would bring him. But Carteret, the English prime minister, paid no attention to the royal Hanoverian feelings, and held steadily to the English policy of peace, both with Prussia and Austria.

Hence, the English policy (which moved the mirth of Frederick the Great with his witticisms over the dual personality of the King of Great Britain and the Elector of Hanover: "Are there two persons in that mystery?") consisted in awkwardly balancing the respective claims of two Powers—Austria and Prussia—which were at war with each other, but were both in alliance with her

and of continuing her war with France, who was (as she was herself) an ally of Prussia. In steering clear of these entanglements, England:

- (a) Helped Maria Theresa against France.
- (b) But would not help her against Prussia.

Prussia, however, cared for her French alliance only in so far as it preserved her from Sweden, whose endless wars with Russia and Denmark still continued at intervals in the further north.

Another figure in the war was Charles Emmanuel of Savoy, King of Sardinia and Prince of Piedmont, whose territory lay on the high road between France and the Italian possessions of the House of Austria. He calmly demanded for every facility he allowed to France or Spain a longer and larger share in the Milanese dominion, which—in a famous simile—he compared to an artichoke, to be swallowed by him leaf by leaf, in successive gulps.

Fearing to be foiled in other directions, in 1741 Maria Theresa appeared before the Hungarian nobles with her infant son in her arms and appealed to their loyalty; and these turbulent and inconstant feudal chiefs, who had so often intrigued with Turk or any other to save themselves from Austria, now broke out into enthusiastic cries: "We will die for Maria Theresa, our king." Maria Theresa, however, though she managed thus to win Hungary, failed to secure the Empire for her husband, Francis of Lorraine, since Charles Albert of Bavaria ultimately secured the election and became Charles VII (elected January 24th: crowned February 12th) in 1742.

In the war that immediately followed:

- (a) The Austrians captured Bavaria in February (1742).
- (b) They ceded Silesia to Prussia in July.
- (c) They conquered Bohemia in the late autumn.
- (d) Their ally, George II, at the head of an English army, won the battle of Dettingen (June 26th, 1743) for them against Maréchal Noailles, an accomplished French general.

Under pressure from England some negotiations took place, in which Frederick the Great secured Silesia from Maria Theresa, but he now began to be afraid of her success, and dreaded espe-

cially her possession of Bavaria. In spite of his agreement to be her ally, as the price for her formal agreement to his holding Silesia, he attacked her and marched on Prague, where she had been crowned in 1743. Already he had begun to form with the Emperor an alliance against her, when the Emperor died and her husband was elected Emperor as Francis I. To secure that this election should be guaranteed her, Maria Theresa had, however, agreed to acknowledge the dead Charles VII as having been lawful Emperor and (the real point of this seemingly unnecessary performance) his son as lawful sovereign of Bavaria. Having thus made sure of the election, and knowing that Frederick the Great by his intrigues and inconstancy had been her real enemy, Maria Theresa now came to terms with the King of Saxony, who was also King of Poland, to divide Prussia between them. From 1756-1763, therefore, Frederick was at bay, fighting to hold together his inheritance; and since Austria, Russia and Bavaria were in alliance, and since only France and Spain were still hostile to Maria Theresa, against his will Frederick was thrown into alliance with France and Spain. *Europe was thus once more re-arranged:*

Austria, Saxony, Bavaria, and England were now against Prussia, France and Spain; France agreeing to refuse all attempts at peace with Austria until Silesia was formally acknowledged to be part of the Prussian territories. It was France, therefore, that saved Prussia; it was on France that at this period Frederick relied; so much so that when France failed him in 1745, he was very nearly overwhelmed by the Austrian troops. That year was memorable in England for the second great Jacobite rising; but again, as in 1715, France refused its support, and, despite a triumphal march into England, Charles Edward Stuart's cause received its final blow at Culloden in 1746.

The only success France had in these years was in her steady progress in her occupation of the Austrian Netherlands: the barrier fortresses were long since hers, and she overran the whole country, defeating the Duke of Cumberland at Lanfield in 1747, as she had already defeated him in 1745 at Fontenoy. Against this the new King of Spain, Ferdinand VI, the eldest son of Philip

V (died 1746), showed no inclination to bind himself to the French political ideals of a family compact of the Bourbons, and moved away from the orbit of French influence. *The peace of Aix-la-Chapelle* in April 1748 showed, therefore, this curious change in the public condition of Europe, England and France forcing peace on Austria and Prussia, against the wish of Austria and on conditions that France found galling to her pride. She had gained nothing by the war; but Frederick held Silesia, and the King of Sardinia held the whole of the Milanese. These two alone had gained. By 1750 England was actually in alliance with Spain against France, and by 1755 Austria had refused to renew her alliance with England. In 1757 Pitt and Newcastle came into power: this was the effective opening of the memorable influence of Pitt on the fortunes of England.

That same year France and Austria came to terms and agreed at Versailles:

- (i) That French troops should be sent to aid Austria.
- (ii) That Prussia should be partitioned.
- (iii) That the bulk of the Netherlands should be put under the care of France.

THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR

The war that followed was, therefore, a double war; it put France, as the ally of Austria, into antagonism with Prussia, and, as the opponent of England, into a gigantic struggle in the colonial world; for in India, in Canada, and in the settlements south of the St. Lawrence river, the rivalry of these two countries, bent on trade, was now to be fought out. It is the period of Clive and Dupleix in India, and of Montcalm in Canada, great administrators and ruthless fighters on opposite sides; but England was better able than France to support her colonists in their adventures, because her energies were not taxed by any land-war at home. She helped Frederick against France, but only by subsidies, and by subsidy she eventually brought Russia into alliance against France. But she would not help Frederick with her arms, even with her fleet. Her refusal of her fleet was due to the fact that she did not want to lose the friendship, or, at least, neutrality,

of Sweden, since so much of her materials for shipbuilding and for her sea-war came from the Baltic (hemp, tar, wood, etc.), and while Sweden and Russia were both afraid of Prussia and not unnaturally suspicious of her, England did not wish, by helping Frederick, to see them in league against herself.

Frederick, therefore, left to his own devices and reckless of the forms of international law, began the contest by invading the unexpected Saxony (its Duke was also the King of Poland), over-ran it, annexed it, and used its army to strengthen his own. That was in August 1756; in November 1757, at Rosbach, he met the French army, supported by an Imperial army, and defeated both. Certainly by this time the French military organisation had been seriously neglected and the provision of the troops was poor. But the public effect of the victory in Europe was to establish the reputation both of Frederick and of the Prussians; and the destruction of the French fighting machine was so masterly that for half a century the French remained inferior to their opponents in Europe. It was not until the efficiency of the ruthless Committee of Public Safety in the days of the Revolution had restored spirit, discipline and her natural fighting capacity to France, that the legend of the invincibility of the Prussians faded from European literature.

Pitt meanwhile, lavishly provided the fleets and land forces of England and made the war as far as possible a naval war at home, but a land war wherever there were colonies to be held or attacked. On the Continent, however, he limited the English contribution almost to cash. The great exception was at the battle of Minden (1759), when the Duke of Brunswick defeated the French, for he had under him there twelve English regiments (six cavalry and six infantry), whom he especially thanked for their services to him. The English foot actually charged the French cavalry. The Marquis of Granby (popular henceforth as an inn sign) succeeded Brunswick in command of his mixed army of "observation." Of course, the national expenditure rose by leaps and bounds, and equally the influence of Pitt in the country increased considerably, especially as the news of the successes which his policy had brought about reached England: Plassey in

1757 and Calcutta, Fort-Duquesne and Louisburg in 1758, Quebec in 1759, Montreal in 1760, Pondicherry in 1761, Martinique, Havana and Manilla in 1762. But already by this time Pitt had ceased to be in the ministry (October 1761), and his place was taken, under George III (accession on October 25th, 1760), by Bute, the royal favourite. In 1763, under the new policy of the king, peace was made with France and Spain. Though England retained St. Vincent, Tobago, Dominica, Grenada and the Grenadines in the West Indies, Florida and Canada in North America, Minorca in Europe, and Senegal in Africa, yet there was much discontent at home at her possessions in India being restored to France, especially since Robert Clive had arrived back in England in 1760 and had been publicly applauded for his success and had set the standard of quickly amassed wealth to many who had hoped to exploit the riches of India undisturbed.

Moreover, the popular mind guessed that the motive of George III in making peace had been for the purely domestic purpose of breaking the power of William Pitt and of the Whigs, under the literary inspiration of Bolingbroke and the Tory ideal of a "patriot king." England now became confused politically by a succession of short-lived Whig ministries under Grenville and Rockingham, etc., by the expulsion of Wilkes from the House of Commons (1764), by the repeal of the Stamp Act (1766) and the declaration of the judges against the legality of general warrants (1766).

But the absence of Pitt from the head of affairs resulted not only in a peace, but in the withdrawal of both England and France from Frederick's war on Austria. Consequently, in 1763, Frederick and Maria Theresa made a treaty of peace, which left Silesia finally to Prussia, and further, gave Prussia the formal status of a great European Power.

FIRST PARTITION OF POLAND

But that very year, 1763, the King of Poland, who was also Duke of Saxony, died; and since the crown of Poland was an elective sovereignty, it now devolved on the nobles to elect his successor. At this juncture Russia was ruled by Catherine II (the

widow of Peter III), a German, the daughter of the petty prince of Anhalt. Catherine determined to force on Poland as its king a Polish noble who had been her friend, Stanislaus Poniatowski; owing to her blustering he was actually elected in September 1764.

But King Stanislaus, having reached his throne and being a patriotic Pole with a desire to help his country, determined to get rid of all those anomalies in the Constitution (the *liberum veto*, for instance, cf. p. 369) which seemed designed to paralyse not only the monarch, but the efficiency of the country itself. Especially did he wish to do this, because, besides his Catholic subjects, he had also under him a small body of Lutherans and Orthodox Eastern Christians and a commercial group of Jews. Since these Lutherans looked to Prussia as their "spiritual home" and the Orthodox to Russia, any noble at the bidding of Prussia, or at the bidding of Russia, could at any meeting of the Diet, hold up the legislation of the country, for by the *liberum veto* (it will be remembered) any noble could veto any proposed Bill. That this fear of his Protestant and Orthodox subjects was not a mere academic question became evident when Catherine (to increase her hold on the Poles) demanded that Lutherans, Orthodox and Jews, should have political rights in Poland (the Lutherans, Jews and Catholics had normally no such corresponding rights in Russia) and the Diet refused (lest a Lutheran or Orthodox noble should hold up all legislation at the order of a foreign Power). Catherine immediately invaded Poland. The King hesitated to attack his benefactress. But, since by the Constitution a gathering of nobles could "make a confederation," and thus form themselves into a legislative and executive body which the *veto* could not affect, some of the nobles did make a confederation, declared war on Russia, and set out to repel the Russian troops. The fighting took place at Balta, a village within the Turkish frontier; during the struggle the Russians burnt the village; whereupon the Turks immediately declared war on Russia (1768). Catherine invaded Turkey with success, capturing Moldavia and Wallachia (1769), and getting a firm hold on the shores of the Black Sea and in the Caucasus. This troubled Austria, which did not wish to see Russia obtaining any hold on territory to the south and east of

her; and it also troubled Prussia, which also had no wish to see Russia increasing in her territorial possessions (henceforward no one *feared* the Turk), but unfortunately for her king, Prussia was definitely bound by treaty to support Russia against Austria or Turkey.

Austria (now ruled by the son of Maria Theresa, the Emperor Joseph II) and Prussia met, therefore, in 1770 at Neustadt to see what could be done to prevent Russia growing too great. Neither Joseph II* nor Frederick ever admitted afterwards that they had raised the question at that interview, and it may truly not have been discussed there, yet certainly the remedy (as it appeared to be to the three Powers separately) must have been in their minds at the time—their joint partition of Poland. Earlier in February of 1769 Austria had invaded Poland and occupied the Zips district, a Hungarian province which had long been incorporated in Poland; in the same month Frederick began to talk and write about a plan which he said he had learnt from Count Lynov, namely, that these three Powers should parcel Poland out amongst them; in January 1771 Catherine II said to Frederick's brother in Petersburg: "Austria has taken part of Poland; why should not Prussia and Russia do the same?" Who really broached the notion first it is not possible to determine; any of the three sovereigns was capable of originating it; all three were capable of discovering it for themselves, since all three were capable later of carrying it into effect. In 1772 the first partition was made:

(i) Austria incorporated the reclaimed Hungarian province into Hungary, and erected her new share of Poland into the kingdom of Galicia, including Lemberg and the country round it, and the south of Little Poland, and parts of Podolia, etc.

(ii) Prussia took most of the northern part (except for Danzig and Thorne), and so linked up Prussia, Eastern Pomerania, Brandenburg and Silesia, into a compact kingdom.

(iii) Russia took most of the rest of Poland, between the Dwina, the Dnieper, and the Drusch.

*Kaunitz had already considered the possibility of this partition of Poland in a memorandum presented to Joseph II in 1768.

Already agreed upon the plan of the partition, on August 5th (is there a fatality about dates?) the armies moved into Poland for its accomplishment. France and England watched without interfering, naturally hoping that there would be no need to interfere, but that the three robbers would quarrel over the spoil. They did quarrel, Frederick seizing two hundred villages beyond his warrant in 1744, when Russia was temporally embarrassed, and Austria occupying the Bukowina and "rectifying" her boundary later in the same year.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

But England had also other motives for abstaining from interference; she was busy elsewhere. In 1773 the tea-riots took place in Boston; in 1774 the petition of Massachusetts for the removal of Governor Hutchinson was rejected by the House of Commons and coercive Acts passed against the colony; the first Congress met at Philadelphia and drew up its plans of independence; and in 1775 it met again and war was declared against Great Britain, and Washington made commander-in-chief of the colonists. As an English commander Washington had led the Virginia militia against the French in 1754 and been defeated, but he had learnt much since those days. Defeated though they were in Canada, the revolting colonists were yet in their own districts better fighters and better generals than the forces sent against them; France gladly aided them, learning from Benjamin Franklin in 1777 in Paris how best to do this—by money and men. Paul Jones on the sea and Washington on land were a successful combination against the British with their German-recruited regiments. But the war was only completed in 1783, after Spain and France had joined forces with the United States against Great Britain; moreover, in her efforts to hold the sea and to prevent help being sent to America, England insisted on maintaining her old "right of search." This annoyed the Northern Powers, who were, therefore, also thrown into the league against Great Britain. Led by Russia, these Baltic States (including also Holland) decided to uphold three principles against England:

(a) Neutral ships were not to be interfered with: "free ships make free goods."

(b) Blockades were only to be lawful when they were actually enforced at the entrance to a port, and not when the whole sea was searched by blockading fleets.

(c) The only contraband was "munitions of war."

In point of fact, Holland alone got embroiled in actual war against England, for the Armed Neutrality of the Baltic managed to keep free from attack; England was, therefore, with her back against the wall, holding out against France, Spain, the States of America and the Dutch Republic; and this war was being fought in Europe, Asia and America, and on all the seas. At one period, overset by the magnitude of her task, England lost control of the sea. It was the one fatal moment which led to the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, in October 1781. The very next year Rodney won a victory over the French off the Island of Dominica, but this came too late to affect the American War. When the Treaty of Versailles was signed in September 1783:

(i) The Independence of the United States, proclaimed on July 4th, 1776, was formally recognised by Great Britain, the Mississippi being the Western boundary of the new States.

(ii) France recovered her East Indies; St. Lucia and Tobago in the West Indies; Senegal and Goree in Africa.

(iii) Spain regained Minorca and Florida.

(iv) England held her West Indian islands, some settlements on the River Gambia, and Negapatam.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

The next date, and the most important at the end of this period, was 1789.

It saw the opening of the French Revolution and the establishment of the United States Constitution, and the election of George Washington as the First President of these "United States."

Of the French Revolution, the following are the chief stages:

(i) *The Meeting of the States General*, 4th May, 1789; on 17th June the Third Estate declared itself the National Assembly; on 27th June it was joined by the nobles and clergy; 14th July saw

CENTRAL EUROPE

1789

Boundary of
The Empire



the fall of the Bastille; France showed her new spirit by refusing in the name of the Revolution in 1790 to aid Spain against England at Nootka Sound.

(ii) *The Meeting of the Assembly* under Mirabeau as President, 30th January 1791. This passed the Civil Constitution for the clergy, but left the Crown as the head of the State and gave it power to nominate the ministers. Leopold II (the brother of Marie Antoinette, the Queen of France) began to form an alliance of princes to protect the monarchy, but when he heard that Louis XVI had accepted the Constitution (September 4th) he declared himself satisfied. But though great changes were introduced into the Constitution, Louis XVI was willing to accept all of them except the Civil Constitution of the clergy. His refusal of this sealed his fate. The monarchy fell on August 10th, 1792, and the Convention was established on September 20th. Earlier in the year France declared war on Austria and Savoy (Sardinia); Prussia joined herself to the two attacked Powers, and Sweden added her forces as well. The Emperor died almost immediately, and the King of Sweden was assassinated; the Austrians defeated the first army of France, but at Valmy (September 20th, 1792) the French army stood up, not only to the Austrians, but to the redoubtable Prussians, and won the first great French victory since the defeat of Rosbach. Then followed other military successes in Savoy and Belgium. A general decree was promulgated that year (November 19th), offering to support all revolting populations against their governments, and another (December 15th) compelling all countries occupied by French troops to accept the new French conditions, and finally (January 21st, 1793) the execution of Louis XVI..

(iii) *The Revolutionary Tribunal* was formed (March 9th) and the *Committee of Public Safety* (July); almost at once the Girondins were overthrown by the Jacobins (June 2nd), and the Reign of Terror began. It was answered by the murder of Marat (July); and this in turn precipitated the execution of Marie Antoinette (October 16th). The *Convention* was created by a decree of June, and consisted of a parlement elected by

popular suffrage; the *Committee of Public Safety*, with its subsidiary boards, was the governing body of the Convention; over all the *Revolutionary Tribunal* held its menace of terror. The effect of this domestic revolution on public affairs in Europe was to cause alarm in many directions:

1793, the Empire, Portugal and Tuscany declared war on France.

France, in turn, declared war on England, Holland and Spain.

Sweden, Denmark and Switzerland declare their neutrality.

The invasion of France by the English failed at Hondschooten (September), by the Austrians at Wattignies (October), by the allies at Toulon (December).

Meanwhile, the French army had been reorganised by Carnot. In 1794 the navy was reorganised by St. André. That same year on the 9th Thermidor (July 27th) Robespierre was overthrown, and with his death the engine of the Terror gradually lost its force.

The military successes of the French, together with the spread of the revolutionary principles everywhere in Europe, enlarged the borders of the French influence. Prussia was induced to surrender the whole of the left bank of the Rhine (1795) and Spain to give up her territory in St. Domingo; the Austrian Netherlands were annexed, and the United Provinces changed into a Batavian Republic.

Under the cover of these alarms, the three neighbours of Poland decided to partition what yet remained to her (September 1793). King Stanislaus was forcibly made to abdicate (1795), and the risings under Kosciusko put down by Russia; Prussia triumphed in possession of Danzig, Thorne, Posen, Guesen and Kalisch.

(iv) *The Directory* was formed at the end of 1795 to provide a new method of government. The Revolutionary Tribunal had done its work and broken down all real opposition. The Reign of Terror was now discontinued. The Directory was meant to be the final form of government now that the first difficulties due to the changes introduced by the Revolution had been overcome.

The scheme of the Directory was based on the American model of a separation of executive and legislative, for the five directors were to have no seat in the legislative assemblies. There were to be two legislative chambers, a Council of Ancients (men of forty-five years and upward) and a Council of Five Hundred (of which, to start with, two-thirds were to be members of the existing Convention); the powers of this legislature were rigidly defined. In these days of the Directory a rising young soldier (born 1769) from Corsica (once anti-French and an enthusiastic admirer of General Paoli, whom the English had supported in his campaign to secure self-government for the Corsicans, and who had Boswell for a friend and Johnson for a master), one Napoleon Bonaparte (Napoleon *Buonaparte* till he had put Robespierre in place of Paoli as his hero, and gone over to the French side) came into prominence. He had suffered in Robespierre's overthrow, but had never relinquished Robespierre's disdain for the mob; his contempt for the people and for any hesitancy in dealing with them continued to the end of his life. Anxiously he watched the feeble fumbling of the Directory, till at last in the moment of crisis he was given his chance on 5th October, 1795; he sternly threatened and then fired on the restless Paris mob which had risen in revolt against the new government. This argument of artillery broke them, and by it he established the Directory. His reward was the command of the French army in Italy; once there, in 1796 he destroyed the power of the House of Sardinia by his victories in Savoy, and by his triumph at Lodi compelled the Austrians to acknowledge the Cisalpine Republic (a revolutionary State formed out of the Milanese, Mantua, and parts of Venetian and Papal territory); similarly, under his victories, Genoa became the Ligurian Republic (1797).

Then Bonaparte advanced across Italy into the Tyrol and threatened Vienna, co-operating in this with the French troops which had successfully attacked Bavaria. This double pressure, with the new enthusiasm of the army of Italy for Napoleon and the power of his prestige, gave the invaders an ascendancy which forced Austria and Prussia to accept peace at Leoben

(April 1797). Already in 1796 Spain had agreed to an alliance with France, having in 1795 declared war on England and made a treaty with the United States to define "contraband of war" against the English interpretation of it. But though the Republic of France, the Batavian Republic, and Spain, were banded together to hold the sea against England, on February 14th, 1797, a French and Spanish fleet were defeated by Jervis and Nelson off Cape St. Vincent, a Dutch fleet at Camperdown by Admiral Duncan (October 11th), and a French fleet destroyed by Nelson at the Battle of the Nile (1st August, 1798). Two French expeditions to Ireland, 1796 and 1798, also badly failed.

On land, however, the effects of Napoleon's success were still spreading; the Roman Republic and the Helvetian Republic were formed in 1798, and the Parthenopean Republic (Naples) in 1799. But in the east Napoleon was effectually blocked from using his victories (the Battle of the Pyramids, 21st July, 1798, had given him all Egypt) by the supremacy of the British fleet. Becoming anxious for the safety of his troops in Egypt because of the British command of the Mediterranean, and exasperated by the continued failure of the Directory (in April, 1798 a conscription law had to be passed), he sailed to France, alone, without his troops, to impose his will on the nation.

(v) *The Consulate* was the result of the new Revolution (November 9th, the 18th Brumaire); the two legislative chambers, as well as the Directory, were abolished, and a dictatorship, though not yet in name, in fact, was created, which gave Napoleon absolute power in France. The Revolution had moved full cycle, from absolutism to democracy, and from democracy to absolutism again.

During all this period the outstanding features were the consolidation of the British rule in India, the reforms of Joseph II in Austria and Hungary, the Russian advance under Potemkin's (d. 1791) policy to a fuller share in the direction of European affairs, the absolutism of Gustavus III of Sweden (1789) and his assassination (1792), the growing importance of the Pope in inter-

national circles, and the new prominence of Ireland in the public affairs of Europe.

IRELAND

This prominence of Ireland dated from the *Civil War* in England. This first gave the Irish people the sight of two sections of her hated rulers at war with each other. Moreover, at the opening of it they watched the Scotch winning their independence from the king. Yet, until the English House of Commons declared against the toleration of Catholics the loyalty of the Irish to the English rule was marked. It was the fanaticism of the English Commons and the policy of the Lords Justices, who deliberately fostered rebellion amongst the Irish in order to justify the confiscation of their lands, that produced rebellion in Ulster and eventually elsewhere. It was noted at the time that during the disturbances the imported Scotch settlers were treated less unsparingly than the English by the rebels, no doubt in the hope of winning their aid to the Irish side in the fight for independence. At first Charles I supported the rising against the authority of Parliament, then grew frightened at its extent and urged its suppression, but later swung back again to sympathise with it, though he tried to form a moderate party from amongst its number under Ormonde. A papal legate was sent to Ireland (1647), but effected little good there. Both sides were suspicious of him. When Charles I was beheaded the Catholics would have been willing to accept the authority of the Parliament, had it shown them any measure of toleration. But Ormonde, who ruled Ireland, pledged it to Charles II. This brought on the island the menace of the Civil War; but even so, Ormonde could have swept the country and held it against *Cromwell*, only he was irresolute and obstinate; his strategy in massing his troops in a few walled towns was faulty, and his refusal to relieve them when they were besieged fatal to his cause. Meanwhile, the political intrigue of Cromwell, at which he was a master, succeeded in sowing discord between the Protestant and Catholic royalists in Ireland; this division accomplished, his policy of massacre was effective in crushing opposition, but it left a bitterness which has never been removed.

1641 - 1892



The religious confiscations that followed and transportations to the West Indies, drew into mutual support the English and the Protestant Irish—which was, no doubt, Cromwell's very design, who dreaded the possibility of an invasion from Ireland now that England was at war with Spain and the Papacy capable of sending a legate to Ireland with a large force of arms. The religious policy of Cromwell was prejudicial to the Anglicans and bitterly hostile to the Catholics, and gave tolerance only to the few Jews to be found in Ireland.

Nor did *Charles II* on his restoration show very much more interest in the good of his Irish subjects. "All parties, however divided among themselves," said Clarendon, perhaps a severe critic and prejudiced, but not unjust, "were united in one unhappy extreme, that is, in their inflexible malice to the Irish." Even the regicides in Ireland were left in possession of the lands of royalists which they held in Ireland. This bitter treatment of the Irish was known abroad, and in 1666, therefore, Louis XIV made a secret league with the Irish Catholics to revolt against Charles II and hamper his alliance with the Dutch. Moreover, the English economic policy was now deliberately hostile to the Irish; the Navigation Act (cf. p. 367 above) for instance, was altered so as to exclude Irish ships in the same way as foreign ships. An Act was even introduced forbidding the import of Irish agricultural produce into England. All this legislation was directed from outside, for on the whole, there was such little feeling of bigotry between the Catholics and Protestants in Ireland, that at this time Archbishop Oliver Plunket was tried for his religion in Ireland by a Protestant jury and acquitted. He had to be brought to England to secure his condemnation and execution. Only gradually was the Irish Government induced to take severer measures against Catholics. The reign of *James II* gave a brief interlude of peace between the two countries, broken, however, before the end of his reign by the arrival of three thousand Irish soldiers in England. The number of these troops was exaggerated by rumour, and their purpose was guessed to be the subjugation of the English. Even a report was engineered that they were actually massacring the English. This legend of the "Irish night" had a

share in the working up of public feeling in England against the Irish in the next reign.

When the crash came, in 1688, and when James II returned a year later to Ireland to make his attempt to recapture his throne, he was careful not to offend the Protestant landlords with any scheme of the redistribution of their land back to the dispossessed Catholics. Further, it must be stated in fairness to Louis XIV that he had no intention of using the expedition to make a French conquest of the island, for he gave instructions that, were James killed in battle, the Prince of Wales was to be proclaimed king. The people as a whole rallied to the standard of the Stuart king. Moreover, Ireland showed itself indeed to be in a moderate mood, for its Parliament of 1689 (in which only ten members were Protestant and the rest Catholic), presided over by James II and sitting for ten weeks in Dublin, passed thirty-five Acts, amongst others one that gave freedom of worship to all Christian bodies, and ordered that tithes were to be paid by each to his own Church. This showed what could be effected in the island by a government with goodwill. But this spirit, which was flagrantly violated by the invading army for England, was hopelessly destroyed by the *Treaty of Limerick* in 1691. Under William III the penal laws against religion were again introduced (1695), and the mercantile theory of the day demanded, and secured the suppression of all Irish industries, as likely to compete with the industries of England.

The effect of this period of bad faith and evil government endured:

(i) Law in Ireland was deprived of all moral sanction, since it was in conflict with the religious feelings of the mass of the nation.

(ii) By depriving the vast majority of the people of all political or professional official positions, the government naturally destroyed any sense of responsibility in the nation as a whole.

(iii) Catholic education was made difficult, and the only education that was possible was deliberately proselytising, so that inevitably the people were driven into ignorance.

(iv) Every inducement was held out to Catholics to surrender spiritual things for material advantages.

(v) By preventing Catholics from buying or holding land, inducements to thrift, industry and discipline were withdrawn from them.

(vi) Encouragement was given by all this to emigration; 400,000 Irish were said to have died in the service of the French monarchy between 1690 and 1740, besides others who enlisted in Spanish, Austrian and Neapolitan armies.

But though this policy of intolerance only affected the Catholics of the country, the attitude of the English government to the Irish industries affected Protestants as well: wholesale emigrations of the Protestant Irish weavers followed to Germany and Holland, and the Catholics to France and Spain. Moreover, further emigrations followed (to the West Indies and to North America) when the Episcopalians used their ascendancy to exclude the Presbyterians from all offices under the Crown.

It was for a medley of motives, religious and economic, that in Ireland the idea of a union between Ireland and England now began to be agitated and of free trade between the two countries ("a happiness we can hardly hope for," said Molineux in 1698). It was at once refused by England. The Irish House of Commons in 1707 addressed to Queen Anne, on the occasion of the passing into law of the Act of Union between Scotland and England, words expressive of this feeling: "May God put it into your royal heart to add yet more lustre to your crown by a yet more comprehensive union of the three islands." But the English commercial classes again objected to this as likely to bring in further competition to their foreign and home markets.

Then, later, the proclamation of the independence of the United States (4th July, 1776), stirred new hopes in Ireland ("no taxation without representation" concerned Ireland too), and when it was seen that France had joined forces with the revolting colonies, a French invasion was equally expected by the Irish on their own shores. The French, too, in their turn, prepared to invade Ireland, but stayed waiting for a revolt. Though Paul Jones, the American admiral, captured ships of war off

Belfast (1778), and though four thousand British troops were removed from Ireland to America, a volunteer movement of Catholics and Protestants to protect the country from invasion roused a great number of the people (supposed to be eighty thousand) to form themselves into a defence corps and to meet to be drilled and armed (1779). By their loyalty in this time of crisis Grattan and Flood helped to create an atmosphere favourable to a more settled peace. But this was presently dissipated, by the failure of Pitt to carry his commercial reforms of relief to Ireland (1784), owing to the continued opposition of the English commercial classes to them; by the absolute refusal of the English government to reform the Irish franchise; and by their refusal to commute the tithes, which fell heavily on the impoverished people and went to support an alien Church. The result of all this disappointment was to fan the flames of rebellion; but so moderate seem *now* the demands of the *United Irishmen*, who were from 1790 the leaders of Irish public opinion (namely (i) universal male franchise, (ii) annual parliaments, (iii) paid Members of Parliament, (iv) the abolition of all property or religious qualifications for an elective vote), that we wonder why they were declared dangerously revolutionary. Pitt, in 1793, granted a Relief Act to Catholics, primarily because it was generally recognised that everywhere Catholicism was the great conservative force against the French Revolution; to this measure he had hoped to add Catholic Emancipation, the commutation of tithes, and the payment of the priests, before he was to ask the Irish Parliament to vote the legislative union of the two countries. This union was, in fact, desired by the Catholics, in the hope that an English Parliament would protect them against the fanatical Protestants of their country. It is worthy of note in connection with this that the first incursion of the Irish bishops into politics was their advocacy of this union in their pastoral letters, and that this advocacy was hesitatingly taken up by them and only at the direct and repeated request of the English government. Meanwhile, in 1794, the Association of United Irishmen was suppressed by law and their society declared treasonable, because, under the leadership of Wolfe Tone, it had become definitely Separatist and was advocat-


ing complete independence from England in order to gain French support.

At this moment (1794) a viceroy (FitzWilliam) came to Ireland under the impression that he was to complete the known ideals of Pitt, and he spoke openly of Catholic Emancipation as an assured measure, and of the promise of commercial and political freedom. The English, when the news was carried back to England, took fright at this, and FitzWilliam, the viceroy, was disowned and recalled (1795). The result in Ireland was a bitter disappointment and a conviction that Pitt had gone back on his word. The next year a French force landed in Ireland; but it was only a small body of men, and the rising that took place was suppressed (1798).

Meanwhile, George III refused to accept Pitt's pledged Bill to give emancipation to the Catholics; and because Pitt had secured the passing of the *Act of Union* largely through Catholic influence and with the definite promise of Catholic Emancipation as the reason for securing the support of that influence, he now in consequence resigned (1801). But he returned again to power (1804) and under pledge to the King not to introduce again a Bill for Catholic Emancipation. Though he may have felt that he could not, without disloyalty, leave his country, in the extreme peril in which England then stood, to the guidance of Fox and his friends (whom he thought to be hostile to every civic and national good, and who were the only alternatives to himself that the King had), his resumption of office, despite his pledge once publicly made and now publicly repudiated, had a bad effect, not only on the Irish, but even on his reputation amongst his own people.

THE THRONES OF EUROPE

Indeed, this action of Pitt seems but a normal part of the history of this whole period; in each succeeding generation of it, it had been little else than a catalogue of immoral political transactions, national and international. In truth, this dreary chapter of interminable wars shows the symptoms of that moral decay which everywhere prevailed. However unpleasant it had been in the earlier period to see Europe drenched in blood in the name of



religion, the wars of religion were at least wars fought on abstract principles, which seemed to justify these wars on moral grounds; but no one even troubled to justify these commercial and political wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries on any principles of morality. They were fought to satisfy the determined greed of the various governments concerned. They were not even "wars of nationality," for the nations had by then lost even their earlier share in the control of their destinies and were under the absolute power of their monarchs or of oligarchies which were as tyrannous as the monarchs.

We have passed from the *France* of Francis I to that of Napoleon, a France still governed by an absolute monarch, but at this latter end of it by a monarch whose personal supervision of his so much larger kingdom was both further reaching and more intense than had been possible to his predecessor. So in England the figure of Henry VII, dignified, diplomatic and parsimonious, or of his greedy and overpowering son, showed little contrast by way of autocracy with George III, who steadily bribed his ministers and who was strong enough to enforce even on Pitt the fulfilment of his will. Philip II of Spain and his grandfather Charles V, world-visioned, restless and impatient, had come at the end of the period to be represented by a Bourbon line of kings, who were yet to find in their people a force which would not only give trouble to them, but to their conquerors too. As far as the Empire was concerned, again the same thing can be noted. The descendant of Charles V was Joseph II (Hapsburg only through his mother, Maria Theresa, for on his father's side he was of the House of Lorraine), "my brother, the Sacristan," as Louis XV dubbed him, watching his interfering "reforms" in Church discipline and organisation. Meanwhile, Poland had disappeared from the map of Europe under the encroachments of its three neighbours, who would each have preferred to have taken the whole of it, but feared in such circumstances to lose all by rousing against itself the joint opposition of the other two. Of the three who had benefited—*Austria* had consolidated its home position, but had lost almost all its non-German possessions; it still had its share of the Netherlands, though temporarily overrun by France,

and it had patches of Italian territory round the top of the Adriatic, and it ruled somewhat uneasily Slavs to the south of it. It had not in effect been *the Empire* for many centuries, but it clung to the name.

Prussia had grown up from the Hohenzollern fiefs of Brandenburg Prussia. The last Grand Master of the Teutonic Knightly Order had apostatised, married, secularised his prelacy, and seized the lands of his Order as his personal property. His descendants succeeded to the Brandenburg Electorate, and at last Frederick the Great had filched Pomerania from Denmark, Silesia from Austria, and the whole of North Poland (in two partitions), in order to "round off" his dominions.

Russia, under the Romanoffs from 1613, when Michael (1613-1645) the founder of the House began (a bewildering family in the order of their succession*) had grown into a great State, at the expense of their neighbours, Sweden, Poland, Austria and Turkey. She was to prove to be the vanquisher of the legend of Napoleon's invincibility. The snows of Russia froze the wings of the Eagle. These wings were clipped at Waterloo; and St. Helena saw the Eagle in captivity, the end of what had been begun at Moscow.

Meanwhile, *Sweden* had swiftly formed an empire and lost it. Gustavus Adolphus (1611-1632) and Charles XII (1697-1718) were great generals, and took great decisions with success; but both were killed in moments that seemed the climax of their careers. With the death of Charles near Frederickstein (after he had attacked Russia with the aid of Mazepa and his Cossacks in 1709, been defeated at Pultawa that year, fled for safety to Turkey, and returned in 1718 to attack the full alliance of all his enemies, Russia, Denmark, Prussia, and Hanover-Great Britain, that "soul of fire," as Dr. Johnson called him), the kingdom of Sweden shrank back into its mediæval frontiers.

Holland which was to provide Napoleon with a throne for one of his family, had grown from revolting provinces into a sturdy group of equal States, with a great sea-trade, a scattered colonial empire, and a strong fleet. But the hostility of England, too much

*The six immediate successors of Peter the Great included three women, a babe of one year old, a boy of twelve and an idiot.

like her to be anything except a rival, at last overwhelmed her.

Meanwhile, *the Papacy*, under such Pontiffs as Paul IV (1553-1559) and Pius V (1566-1572), had reformed itself and the Church; under Innocent XI (1676-1689) had taken its place in the political movements of Europe; under Benedict XIV (1740-1758), Clement XIII (1758-1769), and Clement XIV (1769-1774), had re-organised the Church to meet the troubles that faith and discipline were to encounter under the despots and the mobs.

Religion had been the bone of quarrel when the period opened; but it had been the quarrel of the peoples, not of the kings. These had chiefly used religion to exploit their own absolutism or to enable them to have some weapon with which to threaten or defend their own people or those without. By the time a century had passed from the death of Luther, the geography of Europe had been settled religiously and the victorious sweep of Protestantism had been countered and even driven back. The new generation of politicians no longer troubled about religious disputes, for they were in large measure indifferent to religion in itself. But the failure of these *Politiques* was in supposing that the rest of the world had become as indifferent to it as the statesmen had.

Hugo Grotius saw that the old unity of Europe (1583-1645) was broken and had watched the new policy of "indifference" forming and had guessed that it must end in the break-up of any common feeling amongst Christians, who were busy denying that each other's religion was Christian at all. He knew that some bond must be substituted for religion in order to hold peoples together against these interminable wars, and he offered international law (as *Vittoria* had developed it before him) to be the new binding element in the formation of this new "indifferent" world. It brought against him personally in his lifetime the furious opposition of his countrymen, who did not want to accept even this unity. But it raised also everywhere many hopes. Yet the leaders of his age (his book, *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, was published in 1625) refused to look through his legal eyes at a world which still inherited the culture, as well as the

laws, of the old Imperial Rome. At one time the opposition was so strong that he had to hide in order to save his life.*

To the minds of that age the real problem was to establish a balance between the alternating forces of *the monarchy and the people*. At its opening of the modern world "the three Magi" (it is Bacon's phrase), Charles V, Francis I and Henry VIII, had all, by talent and wealth, established their despotisms, against which the only protests heard were from the lips of religion. The Tudors had been succeeded by the Stuarts, and the Stuarts came to the throne against an Act of Parliament and in the name of hereditary sovereignty and the divine right of kings. In France the problem was complicated by a change made by the Catholic League which, under the Guise, opposed the royal absolutism of Henry III because of his new political alliance with the "heretic" Henry of Navarre and of its fear that he would use that absolutism to the hurt of the Catholic cause. The Huguenots, who had been rebels against the monarchy so long as the monarchy was Catholic, became immediately supporters of the monarchy when it seemed favouring them, and still more when it was evidently to be inherited by their Henry of Navarre.

As the period went forward to its close the thrones almost everywhere were occupied by absolutist sovereigns; wherever there had been a constitutional monarchy there was now, as the eighteenth century ended, either a throned despot or a revolution; and the revolution was everywhere a national force that had broken through the fetters that had held it under guard. The names of Louis XIV, or Frederick the Great of Prussia, or Peter the Great, or his no less great successor, Catherine II, or the Swedish monarchs with their sudden seizures of power, are illustrative of what had been happening everywhere. There was one exception, England, where another power had overset the Crown.

Curiously *England* had been early diverted from being an

*By the contrivance of his wife he escaped out of his prison in a chest used for the conveyance of linen and goods while she remained behind in his stead. He remained in peace for some time in the Catholic Netherlands, but had no real home again anywhere. He was too heavy with scholarship to grace any court or carry final favour.

absolute monarchy through the recovery of their power by the great nobles. Their power became supreme because of their surpassing wealth. The Tudors, who had thought to cure the "overweening ambition of great subjects," had really re-established them. The spoils of the monasteries had gone to create some of them and to enrich all of them. By the religious suppressions and confiscations, the Crown had gained little enough, except what Elizabeth (a true granddaughter of Henry VII) was able to amass and hold. Men in her time called her a miser; but she was a statesman enough to know that a poor sovereign surrounded by wealthy nobles would have little chance to get his own way. James I realised the position, coming out of Scotland to this new affluence; but Charles I, who was unaffected by his father's traditions and who was generous even to artists (an unusual quality in English sovereigns), threw the royal treasures to the wind. By his policies, as well as by his wealth, he had raised against him the commercial classes, the city of London, and the extreme religions; these three were to break him down. But Cromwell, who was of the trading class, a friend of London, and the abettor of the extremists in religion, wearied his generation of this ideal in action. His example cured men of any dreams for an uncrowned king. The Crown was re-established; but the nobles recovered their power. Later, the Whig oligarchy secured in William III a sovereign who depended on their goodwill for the accomplishment of his foreign policy (all he really cared for); they fought over the power that was now divided amongst them, but they fought only with each other.

Only under George III was the crown for a while in the ascendancy, because George III was the first English king of the new line rich enough to corrupt his nobles. Dunning noted in the House of Commons in 1780 this rise of the royal ascendancy, deplored it in his motion before Parliament, and naturally carried the House to agree with him since it was the House that was being hurt in its powers by this recovered royal rivalry. George IV, by his profligate extravagance, effectively disposed of any further menace from that quarter, whether as king or regent. Moreover, by his date another force, long at work, had burst

through the barriers that guarded political supremacy and had taken possession of the power of the Crown.

THE MIND OF EUROPE

With religion destroyed as an independent power under the Protestant settlement, which had been imposed on England from above, the political philosophers began to discuss the rights, duties and origins of kingship. England was rich in thinkers and writers, to whom this problem was fascinating; Milton had his theories of political science, chiefly instigated in 1649 by his opposition to the publicly-expressed theories of the first Stuarts. Sir Robert Filmer (who found that, in their acceptance of a power to depose kings, Bellarmine and Calvin were agreed, in opposition to his denunciation of rebellion) published his *Patriarcha* in 1680 to counter the effect of Milton, whose voice, though dead, still thundered.

Hobbes (1588-1679), who followed him, urged, on the other hand, that every government was right. He was the most original of the *political philosophers* ("If I had read as much as other men, I should have been as foolish as they"). Was this due to his refusal to fight and his escape abroad rather than be forced into the civil war and his meeting with many foreign thinkers, or was it due to his endless pipes of tobacco? His absolutist theory at any rate was chiefly in favour of the mass of the people, *Leviathan*, this "mortal god." Their will was law.

Locke (1632-1704) took up the problem and, with more intellectual force than any of his predecessors or contemporaries, solved it in such a way as to be able to justify the Revolution of 1689. But, whereas Hobbes supposed that an agreement amongst the people had established a king over them, Locke argued (as the mediæval thinkers had done) that the compact was of the people with their sovereign, and not merely of the people amongst themselves; he transferred in effect the declaratory right claimed by the popes in their deposing power, from the Church to the Lords and Commons. This produced the Schism of the Non-Jurors who would not allow that the Church of England could admit the deposition of its royal head.

The French philosophers, who (despite the wars between France and England) were now openly in favour of English ideas and English institutions, borrowed these political speculations regardless of their possible effect. Voltaire (1694-1778), with his dislike of Catholicism as a religion, but his patronage of it as a restraining influence on the "lower orders," turned his nice skill in sarcasm to commend the new materialistic interpretation of history which had thrown over the Christian theory of authority and replaced it by one no longer entangled with the name of God. The Encyclopædists, who accepted the views of their greatest member, continued the work till it reached Rousseau, to whom sentiment was the moving principle of philosophy, politics and art. Rousseau (1712-1778) said in one of his letters that his *Contrat Social* was intended as a defence of the principle of aristocracy; but he was in reality the disciple, not of Locke, but of Hobbes, except that he was much more emotional and lacked Hobbes' sturdiness and selfish rudeness. He was a Hobbes in ruffles and lace. He was misunderstood.* His was the saying that "the blood of a single man is more precious than the liberty of the whole human race."

But the *general political restlessness* of the period—its acceptance and repudiation of absolutism—was due to a concentration of causes:

(i) The wars bewildered the ordinary citizen, who could not follow what they were all about. His questions received no more satisfaction than did those of "little Peterkin."

(ii) The prevailing lack of religion, due to the scepticism of the intellectuals, the aloofness of the higher clergy from the lower, the quarrels between different schools within the Catholic Church, which ultimately led to heresy (1699 between Bossuet and Fénelon; in 1713 the Jansenist controversy; in 1710 Port Royal with its subterfuges and its narrow bigotry; in 1687 the quietism of Molinos, etc.), and the nationalist senti-

*"As nature gives each man absolute power over his limbs, so the social contract gives the body politic absolute power over its members and makes it master of all it possesses . . . The two main principles of government established in the *Contrat Social* are that the sovereignty always belongs legitimately to the people and that aristocratic government is best." (Rousseau.)

ments of the clergy as against the unity for which the Papacy stood.

(iii) The refusal of the commercial communities to be taxed without having some say either in the way the tax should fall or in the way it should be spent, seen in the revolt of the colonies in North America and in the agitation of John Wilkes.

(iv) The increase of wealth amongst the better classes which pushed up prices and reduced the purchasing power of the wages of the town population.

(v) The severity of discipline in the navy and new armies.

(vi) The principles of the new science of economics. The Economist Society founded by Turgot in Paris, 1767, and the perpetual devising of severer methods of extortion by the various economic reformers. Thus the *Corvée* was introduced into France in 1737, abolished in June 1776, and restored in August 1776; free corn was introduced 1763, abolished and restored in 1774.

But there were certain international factors that were now beginning to make for a more general peace; the Bank of England, for instance, was established in 1694, and the Royal Bank of France in 1719. More perhaps than all in England was the rise of the new movement of religion under such teachers as Wesley (he founded his Methodist Society in 1729, went to Georgia in 1735, returned and opened his first meeting place in Fetter Lane in 1738) which gave religion to the poorer population in England, and saved the country from the godless side of the Revolution. Indeed, in Birmingham there were riots against Priestley in 1791, and the mob threatened his life when it was known that he disbelieved in God. In 1780 the Gordon Riots showed that the anti-Catholic habit of the Reformation continued.

But equally the spirit of revolt was abroad in England. In 1795 George III was assaulted on his way to Parliament; already Paine had published in 1791 his *Rights of Man* and fled to Paris to escape the penalties that his theories would be sure to bring on him. His printer was condemned, however, in his absence, and the book declared treasonable. In 1797 the famous naval mutiny of the Nore broke out. Yet by the side of this restlessness, which

made the Revolution a very present danger to Pitt's government in England and frightened Edmund Burke (1729-1797) into opposition to it, there were signs of a more balanced independence of thought that could hold the scales in perfect poise, as the impeachment of Warren Hastings in 1787, which was the first defence of the conquered races by the intelligence, wit and eloquence of England, and the beginning of the movement for the liberation of slaves.

But the point that needs most to be remembered is that already religion was becoming again the centre of European preoccupation, and religion was now at last realised to be something divorced from the power of the State. Louis XVI could have compromised with the Revolution, had he agreed to accept the "constitution" of the clergy, who were to take an oath to accept the teaching of the State. He was not a statesman, but he was an honest and devout Catholic, and this piety of his saved him from blunders from which the statesmen, the "enlightened despots," and the revolutionary mob were not free. The new worship of the goddess of reason was as much a State religion as the dispossessed Catholicism had been. Indeed, it had all the disadvantages of an established religion and none of the advantages, for it was not a religion, but a philosophy exhibited in *tableaux vivants*; it taught morals as a schoolmaster might, and not as a priest should.

The Catholic Church in France had defended against the Jansenists the freedom of the human will even under the movement of divine grace, and against Molinos and Fénelon the need of human activity even in moments of the most passive prayer; she had upheld the reforms of Monsieur Olier against the Court, and the unity of Christendom against the Gallicans, and had suffered on the scaffold in the person of the monarch as well as of the clergy, in order to preserve the existence of a free Church in a State that had broken free.

In art the same struggle was going on between the forms of tyranny and the new determination to be free. The absolutism of the Renaissance artist over his craftsmen is to be seen in Henry VII's chapel, where the sculptor has merely followed designs given him; its overpowering effects were to be seen in the churches

of the age of Queen Anne. Great artists were still able to show new lines of beauty, but they, even less than the inferior artists, would allow to their common workmen no initiative or free play. The ornament of the new style gave no scope to the workman to suit his own fancy; it was geometrical; it was not capable of offering any scope for individuality to the worker. The houses and buildings of the Queen Anne and the Georgian style were stately, solid, wealthy and aristocratic. Above all, they invariably suggested the city. Blenheim Palace in Woodstock and Castle Howard in the North of England, show what the style could easily accomplish in the hand of a great master; the unity of the building achieved by means of a dome; while Versailles (especially in its later developments of the Petit Trianon or the Hotel Soubise) showed how graceful the style could become by skill in arranging its proportions of weight and mass. Architecture now is essentially monumental, and city architecture for almost the first time is concerned to plan and build a perfectly designed street. A happy comparison could be made by some skilled lover of architecture between the two complete cities built at once, each by a great patron, Pienza by Pius II and Richelieu by the Cardinal de Richelieu, with the sharp contrast made by the difference of two hundred years or so.

Again, in *poetry*, the English poets, for instance, gave evidence of what was happening everywhere; the older Elizabethans with their lyrical and Italian traditions developed into Milton (1608-1674), at the last so typically Roman; then Dryden (the keenest and noblest critic amongst our whole cycle of poets) and Pope, both artists in verse, imprisoning in their severe metres the molten lava of a Shakespearean, careless abundance, and letting the conceits of their fancy develop into fine but deliberately restrained forms. This new mood was the triumph of form over matter, the expression of severe dignity, cultured rather than free. Again, in England came the reaction against the older formularies, for the metaphysical poets were followed by the lake poets, with Shelley and Keats showing an even fresher life. Though they would have been pained to know it, these last (the poets of nature and fancy) were the harbingers of a recovery in orthodox religion. From the

Lake Poets, or what had created them, came both the Tractarians and the Chartists. The French Revolution was but a symptom of a deeper political explosion of a natural force that had been held under since the Reformation. The poems of Shelley (1792-1822) were another symptom. The art lectures of Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792) are such another symptom. Keble's (1792-1866) sermons were yet a fourth.

In *painting*, the French had already great achievements to record, and the Louvre is full of the works (Watteau, Fragonard, etc.) inspired by Louis XIV and his circle. Frederick II of Prussia tried to copy this in his patronage of the arts, and especially of Monsieur Voltaire, who had no objection to being lionised, and who would even, to show his pleasure, give his approval of the royal poetry in the King's hearing. But Frederick discovered by chance Voltaire's real opinion, and was hurt. Drama in France reached a height of greatness under the names of Racine (1639-1699), Corneille (1606-1684) and Molière (1622-1673).

It was the age of a recovered *science*, too: such as was evident in Charles II, with his foundation of the Royal Society, Newton (1642-1727), Benjamin Franklin, American ambassador in Paris and inventor and electrician (1706-1790), and Herschel with his patient astronomy (1738-1822). The dates of Watt, the engineer (1736-1819), of Priestley, the chemist (1733-1804), of Linne, the Swedish botanist (1707-1778), of Buffon, the French naturalist (1707-1788), of Captain Cook, the explorer (1728-1779), who had three times circled the globe, show to what extent this period became a pioneer and master for the genius of our own age. Also it was the age of so many new social habits—the coffee house (which for the poorer sort became in London the “gin palace”), the newspaper, and the popular musical comedy.

CHAPTER IX

THE VICTORIAN COMPROMISE

THE EMPIRE OF NAPOLEON

NAPOLEON ended the Revolution. It was his success in overpowering the Paris mob on the 5th of October, 1795, which rallied the country to his side, and which gave him his first popularity and thereby an opportunity to fulfil his dreams of an unknown destiny of greatness. In fulfilling his dreams he cleared away an essential quality of the Revolution, or at least a quality which it had looked upon as essential to itself. The Revolution had summed up for itself all the theories of its prophets in three words: Fraternity, Equality, Liberty. With the first, Napoleon as a soldier born had every sympathy; with the last he awoke Europe. But for Equality, in the sense in which it was used by Rousseau and his friends, he had never any sympathy. It was this that he destroyed. He was willing in some degree to advocate Equality "before the law" (though he was never an absolute believer even in that), but, in its wider sense, he could not as a soldier have had any personal conviction in favour of either its truth or its expedience. That Napoleon made peace with the Catholic Church was one proof amongst several that he had discarded Rousseau's meaning of the word, for it was Rousseau's egalitarian and anarchic philosophy that brought against him the opposition of the Catholic Church. Napoleon spoke of himself always as "the Revolution," and he did undoubtedly carry over into the new world which he created much of the spirit of it, its demoniacal energy, its military adventure and enthusiasm, its almost religious quality of sincerity, its sense of simplicity, and

its insistence upon the universality of men's needs, hopes and fears.

Yet for all that he also introduced into his new world several measures wholly foreign to the Revolution:

(i) The *Code Napoleon* (1804), a simplification and synthesis of law which is still the main source of law for most European countries. It was partly built up on the foundations of the law of Rome, but all that was best in the old French systems found a place in it. It included a *droit administratif* which enabled government officials to sue in a court which was outside the ordinary methods of securing justice, and though more efficient, was very much less "egalitarian" than, for instance, the English law.

(ii) The *Concordat* (1802), whereby he made peace with the Catholic Church. Louis XVI had refused to accept that part in the revolutionary constitution which put the Church under the State: yet that subordination of religion to the people had seemed to the authors of the Revolution so essential to it that the King's refusal to accept this one point of it caused his death. The Church, too, had refused to accept this relationship, and though hunted and persecuted, had remained on in hiding in the villages and towns (even when its bishops had fled oversea). The Catholic Faith was still in the hearts of the people. Napoleon realised this and came to terms with the Pope. A compromise was arranged whereby the old hierarchy was removed and a new hierarchy established. Henceforward, too, the appointment of the bishops lay with the government, but religion in its teaching was to be free of government interference. In this way the essentials of Church freedom had been retained, but the uttermost sacrifice of all but essentials to Napoleon had had to be made by the Pope to achieve this.

(iii) The *Empire* (1804) which he established. Napoleon secured the presence of Pope Pius VII in Paris, arranged for his coronation, and at the solemn ceremony, though allowing the Pope to anoint him, he himself placed the imperial crown on his own head (2nd December, 1804). Not realising that the



NAPOLEONIC FRANCE

older emperors claimed to be emperors of the whole world, he added to his title, "of the Franks," supposing that by doing so he was connecting his imperial position with the legends of Charlemagne and claiming an equal share in that imagined dignity. Nor did his claim to empire seem fantastic. The Empire had shifted its centre more than once in history. After all, Charlemagne's title had undoubtedly come from the hands of the Pope. Again, the Empire had been transferred by the Pope from Charlemagne's heirs to the Germans two hundred years later. Why should it not now again after eight hundred years come back to one who ruled the old territory of the Franks, and whose legend would perhaps later occupy as large a place in history as had done the story of the great ruler of the Franks? But whereas Charlemagne halved the world only with an eastern emperor, Napoleon had to admit the presence in Europe as independent rulers, of emperors other than himself. Immediately he had assumed his title, the emperor in Vienna

began to call himself "Hereditary Emperor of Austria." Thus, deliberately, the claims of the Holy Roman Emperor (the emperor who *claimed* to rule all Christendom and by whose investiture other monarchs held their royal rights) were surrendered and the Empire itself ceased to be, lapsed, but was not destroyed. By a formal Bill addressed to the German princes a little later (1806), he released them from their obligations to the Empire.

Other new features were added to Napoleon's policy which also were contrary to the Revolution:

The dividing up of Europe into kingdoms, and

The allocating of these kingdoms to members of the family of Napoleon, along with other later changes made, irrespective of the wishes of the subjects.

It is true, however, to say that he certainly did bring about very much which the Revolution desired and would have approved, such as, for instance, a new system of education.

Besides offending the spirit of the Revolution by parcelling out kingdoms amongst his family and his generals, he surrounded himself with a court as gorgeous as, but less artistic than, that of Louis XIV and he created titles of nobility and invented the order or decoration of the *Legion of Honour* (1802), which has survived through all the vicissitudes of subsequent political change in France.

The policy of Napoleon consisted in striving to accomplish two great designs:

(i) The domination of Europe.

(a) By the peace of Tilsit (1807) he induced the Emperor of Russia (Alexander I) not only to make peace with him but to come into line with his policy, giving to Russia as proof of his good will, Finland, Moldavia and Wallachia.

(b) By securing the neutrality of Prussia and forcing Hanover on her so as to antagonize England, and then by forming a Confederation of the Rhine (1806), by which he deliberately made Prussia nervous of his influence in the

very territory which her ambition coveted, and thus, finally, by provoking her to war and crushing her at Jena (November 1806). The French entered Berlin and tore from Prussia its possessions west of the Elbe.

(c) By defeating Austria (and Russia) at Austerlitz (December, 1805) and giving its Tyrol to Bavaria and its Italian possessions to form a kingdom for himself.

(d) By erecting Poland into a Grand Duchy of Warsaw (1809) and giving it to the King of Saxony, and annexing Hanover to France (1810).

(e) By seating his brother Joseph on the throne of Spain, in order to oust the Bourbon king, Charles IV (1808), and partitioning Portugal between France and Spain (1807).

(ii) The destruction of England's power.

(a) He secured Louisiana from Spain in exchange for Tuscany, and then, when he could do nothing with it, sold it to the United States in 1803 to compromise them with England; he had maps of Australia drawn up and printed, in which all the names were given in a French form; he made an expedition to Egypt (1798) in order to have a base whence to threaten the British territories in India. This hope was destroyed by Nelson at Trafalgar in 1805.

(b) By the peace of Tilsit (1807) he engaged with Russia that Sweden and Denmark should be forced into alliance with them and their fleets be used against England. England retaliated by demanding in advance the Danish fleet and bombarding Copenhagen till the fleet was surrendered to it (September 2-8, 1807).

(c) By a decree issued in Berlin, 1806, he declared England in a state of blockade and every ship attempting to trade with England to be thereby liable to capture. But England retaliated by Orders in Council (1807), declaring the Continent in a state of blockade and every ship which did not trade with England to be thereby liable to capture.

Napoleon did not in practice carry out strictly this threat of blockade and boycott.

(i) English tropical goods were essential to the Continent, while French goods were only luxuries to England, the loss of which only the wealthy classes regretted. Hence came smuggling on a large scale. Curiously, at this time the fashion of powdering the hair ended, for since England needed all the flour possible for food, Pitt, in the name of patriotism, urged that the leaders of society should change the fashion.

(ii) Licences were given by either side to individual traders; Napoleon shaved with English razors and wore English clothes.

(iii) He thought that if England bought goods on the Continent and exported gold and silver to pay for what she bought, she was steadily growing poorer.

But though thus the two great forces of France and England, which had fought for the domination of the world since the days of Louis XV, lay opposite to each other, and though the whole of Europe was controlled now by Napoleon, who was determined to block any chance England might have to expand and develop her power, the two nations were so little alike that there was little way open to either side to score; England was invulnerable at sea, and France on land.

Yet the chance came, and, unexpectedly at the time, it came in Spain. Here Napoleon found himself in the same condition as the allies had been when invading France after the Revolution. He had deposed Charles IV of Spain to make his own brother, Joseph, king (1808). But his troops were looked on as foreign enemies by the Spaniards, and they met a nation in arms. Napoleon had surely drifted far from the spirit of the Revolution by the time he invaded Spain, for it could not have been part of that spirit to remove a national sovereign only to substitute for him a foreign sovereign. The Spaniards, anyhow, had no intention of submitting to this, even though the monarchy itself accepted its degradation. For the Spaniards:

(i) Had no sympathy with the principles of the Revolution;

- (ii) Had no respect for the glory or success of the French imperial armies;
- (iii) Had no desire for a Bonaparte king nor for an international code of law.
- (iv) Were content with their Catholic religion, untrammelled and free.

The Spaniards, therefore, began by attacking the French troops in small engagements, harassing their advance, and cutting off detachments of the troops. On July 21st, 1808, they even surrounded General Dupont and his army at Baylen and compelled them to surrender. This was exactly the opportunity that the English government had been waiting for; the command of the sea put them in a position to send their forces to the Spanish coast, so Sir Arthur Wellesley in 1809 took over the command and organised the Spanish forces as well as the English against the French. Napoleon then entered Spain, and the French, under his guidance and under Soult, won many battles. But the patience of General Wellesley triumphed in the end. His method was trench warfare, and he prepared for a long campaign; the two lines faced each other at Torres Vedras. During the winter, by mutual arrangement, there was no fighting, but in the spring the fighting began again. By the battles of Talavera (1809), and the capture of Ciudad Roderigo and Badajoz (1812), and the victories of Salamanca (1812) and Vittoria (1813), the French were cleared out of Spain, and finally France was invaded (1813) and the French defeated at Toulouse (April 10th, 1814).

Meanwhile, Napoleon had come in conflict with another nation in arms, which proved even more fatal to his success. He attacked Russia. Alexander had indeed accepted the ideas of the emperor at Tilsit and had at first carried them out faithfully, but he was eventually driven into opposition:

- (i) By the English blockade of the Continent, which ruined the Baltic trade of Russia.
- (ii) By Napoleon's annexing Oldenburg to the North German territories of France (1810).
- (iii) By the creation of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw and the gift of it to the King of Saxony (1807).

(iv) By Napoleon's choice in 1810 of an Austrian archchess for his wife in place of a Russian princess.

In June 1812 Napoleon began his invasion of Russia, his objective being the capture of Moscow, and his policy to dictate there terms of peace as he had done in Vienna and Berlin. But though he won a great battle at Borodino (September 7th) and entered Moscow (September 14th), he was left alone there, though he waited till October 18th for the Tsar to send him envoys to ask for peace. The Russians refused to come to terms. After delaying as late as he dared, without any result, he saw himself forced by the winter to retreat over to the frontier again; this he had to do in the face of a hostile population and the pitiless Russian winter. Out of his force of 600,000 men, drawn from his subject peoples, he returned with less than 200,000, but the loss of men was almost his lesser defeat. His prestige as well as his army had been hurt by the snows of Russia. In Spain his generals had been worsted; here he himself had been compelled to retire.

When the troops reached the frontier near Vilna (December 5th), Napoleon hurried home to Paris, leaving the army to follow him. As in its moment of defeat (1799) he had left his army in Egypt in order to go home alone, so now again he deserted it and fled alone to the capital.

Seeing him thus weakened, Prussia took heart. Though its king had never accepted the Napoleonic idea in the same way as Alexander of Russia had done, Prussia had played the part of a neutral during twelve years of Napoleon's triumph, had watched even with some complacency the destruction of its rival, Austria, at Austerlitz (1805), and had only been pushed into war when it saw that the Confederation of the Rhine and the German kingdoms accepted the French emperor as the official leader of the German people—a Charlemagne ruling these new Franks. After it had taken the field against him it had been crushed at Jena in 1806. After that battle the Prussian king, realising now what was likely to be his fate, re-organised his army within the small limits allowed him by the terms of the treaty which he had been forced to accept, and introduced a system of short service in the army. Thus he was able to train his whole male population in arms.

Napoleon returned from Russia on 5th December, 1812, and thus weakened was attacked by a Prussian general, Count York Von Wartemberg, and eventually by the whole Prussian force. In the early months of 1813 the other German princes came into alliance with Prussia, and later Austria again attacked the forces of France. Napoleon's marshals were badly beaten. Oudinot was defeated by Bülow in August, Macdonald by Blücher, and Ney by Bernadotte. The great battle of Leipsic in October 1813 came after ten months of stubborn fighting. It was a definite defeat. The Russian campaign had done irreparable harm to Napoleon's prestige; now he could no longer rally his troops round him with the same enthusiasm as before, and he had for a third time against him, as he had had in Spain and Russia, a nation in arms.

NAPOLÉON'S DOWNFALL

In 1814, therefore, from the east and from the south, Prussia, Austria and the Anglo-Spanish armies crossed the French frontier and marched on Paris. The generals of Napoleon declared that their men would no longer defend him; and he saw against him even his old marshal Murat, whom he had made King of Naples (1808) and who now supported the coalition and helped it by driving the French out of Italy. Broken by defeat, bankrupt by his extravagance, and exhausted by his years of fighting, Napoleon abdicated in April and retired to Elba, which was allowed him by the alliance. Paris had already been captured by the allies on March 30th. At Vienna a congress met to re-organise the damaged frontiers of Europe. As a preliminary, Louis XVIII, the brother of the guillotined Louis XVI, was restored to the French throne. But the substitution of Louis XVIII for Napoleon proved so poor an exchange in public eyes, and the French felt so humiliated at the loss of their glory, and were so dissatisfied by the new form of government which freed them from very little of their old tyranny, that in a short while the people turned impatiently to their old hero. Hearing that the popular cry was for him and knowing that the plenipotentiaries were quarrelling in Vienna, Napoleon suddenly left Elba, landed in France (March

1st, 1815) and appeared in triumph at Paris (March 20th), promising freedom to the Press and liberty to all citizens.

Once more the allies gathered together their armies to surround Napoleon if they could. The Duke of Wellington (who had led the Spaniards when he was Sir Arthur Wellesley) and Marshal Blücher held the lines of the north in Belgium, where alone Napoleon could break through. Thus was renewed the old strategy of Marlborough, designed to suit the altered circumstances of the new warfare; after heavy fighting, the English general, at the head of a mixed army of his own troops, Dutch and Flemings, on June 15th, 1815, fought Napoleon to a standstill at Waterloo, shattered the final assault of the famous Imperial Guards, and (as he had arranged) was joined by Blücher and his Prussian troops in the late afternoon when the French were exhausted and tasting defeat. The effect of the arrival of the Prussians was overwhelming. The French surrendered or fled. Napoleon rode off from the field, knowing that this time he had met his final overthrow. The allies occupied Paris on 7th July, 1815, for the second time; for the second time (June 22nd) Napoleon abdicated in favour of his little son by Marie Louise of Austria (the pathetic "eaglet", called, in the Napoleonic style, the King of Rome, born 20th March, 1811), and then, after eluding the Prussians, who would have shot him without trial, surrendered to the British (July 15th). After taking refuge on H.M.S. *Bellerophon* he was exiled to the island of St. Helena, where he died in 1821, on the 5th of May. His last words expressed where his treasured hopes most lay: FRANCE, ARMÉE, TÊTE D'ARMÉE, JOSEPHINE. These were the things he had really loved. His tomb in Paris remains his great monument, close to the hostel he had built for the wounded soldiers of his "grand army", the *Hôtel des Invalides*, a place of pilgrimage for all those to whom the legend of Napoleon makes appeal: "He was as great as a man can be—without virtue", was the verdict of de Tocqueville. It sums up briefly the verdict of mankind.

It is clear that the battle of Waterloo and the place of exile in the little island of St. Helena in the Atlantic had the necessary dramatic qualities to complete appropriately the legend of Napo-

CENTRAL & WESTERN

EUROPE

1815

GERMAN CONFEDERATION

0 Miles 500



leon. The eagle, chained to his lonely rock, the conqueror of Europe refusing to see any one of his gaolers (neither the German nor the French representatives) except the British, occasionally producing epigrams on the beauty and truth of the Catholic faith or the glory of France, was careful to do nothing at the end to hurt his renown. It was a quiet ending to a life lived stormily in the full glare of four continents.

The *battle of Waterloo* was itself picturesquely equal to its purpose; it was a perfectly timed battle, the technically proper ending to a campaign, brief and compressed into the shortest possible time. It was a final thing, and as a military event was absolutely thorough. It put an end to Napoleon. Its effects can be summarised:

- (i) It ended the military supremacy of the Revolution.
- (ii) It saved the monarchies of Europe.
- (iii) It left a France permanently divided into Royalist and Republican parties.
- (iv) It gave to the British arms a military prestige which lasted till the South African War, and was indirectly responsible for the refusal of England to introduce conscription or to support an army commensurate with its political commitments.
- (v) It restored European respect for Prussia, which had been lost through the years of its neutrality, because at Waterloo
 - (a) The Prussian force was the largest single unit engaged in the battle;
 - (b) The march of Blücher to fulfil his promise of joining his forces to Wellington was a great military accomplishment;
 - (c) Its arrival in the late afternoon gave it its proper dramatic entry as the decisive factor in the campaign.

CONGRESS OF VIENNA

When the Congress again assembled at Vienna, therefore, the English and Prussians re-entered it with increased prestige. Moreover, the coalition that had preceded the campaign ending in the battle of Leipsic (1814) had been itself the result of diplomatic conventions which therefore already pledged the Congress of Vienna to certain conditions of peace. The ground was not

quite free. The plenipotentiaries had already in some degree their hands tied. Thus, for instance, the German princes had been promised their freedom from the Empire, the King of Bavaria had been guaranteed full sovereignty, and so on.

But though Russia and Prussia had thus completed their preliminary arrangements to bind the Congress beforehand, England, Austria and France agreed in a secret treaty to insist upon other terms which suited themselves. At last, after several months, a scheme of redistribution of territory was evolved:

Russia was given a larger share of the again-partitioned Poland, including most of Napoleon's Grand Duchy of Warsaw.

Prussia was given Lusatia and about half Saxony (to punish the Saxon king, who had habitually supported Napoleon), Swedish Pomerania and a large district in the Rhine.

Germany was now formed into a confederation of States, consisting of five kingdoms and seven grand-duchies, with thirty-five duchies, principalities and free cities. These, organised into a diet of two chambers, were to be presided over by Austria.

Sardinia had Piedmont, Savoy and Genoa given back again.

Austria regained Milan and Venetia.

Parma was given to Marie Louise with a reversion at her death to Charles Louis, the son of the Bourbon duke whom Napoleon had dispossessed. She lived on till 1847.

Modena was restored to Francis IV.

Tuscany was restored to its Grand Duke Ferdinand, the brother of the Austrian emperor.

Naples was restored to its Bourbon prince, Ferdinand I, for Murat had gone back on his loyal allegiance to the allies when Napoleon fled out of Elba and had joined the Imperial Standard for those Hundred Days. He was deposed, fled to Corsica, returned to Naples, was captured and shot. His sons took refuge with the British fleet and later went to the United States.

Spain was restored to Ferdinand VII.

Portugal was restored to Queen Maria, now insane, under the regency of her son John, later John VI.



Holland, formed out of all the Netherlands, was given as a kingdom to William of Orange.

Sweden, now ruled by Bernadotte, Napoleon's marshal, lost Pomerania to Prussia and Finland to Russia, but gained Norway from Denmark.

Switzerland was re-established and enlarged to twenty-two cantons.

France was restrained to its old boundaries of 1790.

England emerged with Malta, Heligoland, a protectorate

over the Ionian Isles, and the possession of Ceylon, the Cape of Good Hope, Mauritius, St. Lucia, Tobago and Trinidad.

Thus, of all the Powers assembled at Vienna, while most were restored to their original possessions, the two that lost most heavily were Sweden and Denmark; Russia and Switzerland gained slightly, England and Prussia came out with the richest loot.

Of all the presiding figures at the Congress, the foremost authors of the new world had been *Metternich*, the Austrian minister, who had in 1810 arranged the marriage between Napoleon and Marie Louise, and who now set to work to break the spirit of the son of that marriage, and *Talleyrand*, the representative of Louis XVIII, Bishop of Autun before the Revolution, a constitutional bishop under the Revolution, then a diplomat of the Napoleonic régime, and now the chief foreign statesman of Bourbon France. But in this Congress we know both from what it accomplished and from the chief envoys who took part in it, that the chief principle that had been used in apportioning these territories was called the principle of *legitimacy*, i.e., the politico-legal principle that territories belonged to the legitimate heir of the last ruler and not to the group that peopled them. Thus were the principles of the Revolution, which had been disregarded by Napoleon, deliberately and publicly denied.

But just as Napoleon had been successful against kings but ineffectual against nations, so the Congress of Vienna found itself equally at a loss by the steady refusal of the nations to accept the new system. Napoleon's experience was ultimately to be theirs, namely, that the determinations of a people are, in fact, irresistible.

- (i) Belgium wished to be separated from Holland.
- (ii) Italy wished to be rid of the Austrians.
- (iii) The Poles longed to re-possess their unity.
- (iv) The German Confederation wished to re-establish its complete racial unity—

to exclude Austro-Hungary, which was (though with large German territories) mainly a non-German Power; to include all German-speaking lands, such as Schleswig, Holstein and Alsace.

(v) The subject Slavs, Czechs, Balkans and Greeks to break free from Austria and Turkey.

It was evident, therefore, that in the years following the Congress, Austria, under Metternich, who was more responsible than anyone else for the treaty, would have most difficulties to meet, from the Germanic princes, from Italy, and from its subject nationalities; and that Prussia, as the leading Germanic Power, with Italy, would be the centres of European political disturbances. To remember these two points is to have the key to the foreign politics of the nineteenth century. Also, the recovered prestige of the Papacy should be noted, which had emerged triumphant from its battle with Napoleon; for, though without troops, it met him as an equal, refusing to join the blockade of England, refusing also on the other side the offer of an English man-of-war and a safe retreat in Malta, and going to the farthest limits in its surrender to Napoleon of every possible authority over ecclesiastical persons in France compatible with the freedom of its inalienable spiritual doctrines.

ENGLAND

The other emergent force was England—emergent, firstly, because of all the Powers at the Congress her claims could be most easily met, since they were only on territories outside Europe and, as yet, territories outside Europe had not been properly valued by anyone but her; emergent, secondly, in her newly-discovered military strength (her earlier land-expeditions on the Continent had usually been failures till the days of Wellington); and emergent, thirdly and more especially, since her political system appeared to the struggling nationalities of Europe to be the most perfect then existing.

It must be remembered that the strength of Napoleon in France had been at first his successful dealing, not perhaps so much with the Revolution, as with the revolutionaries; he impressed discipline on a mob that had got out of hand. At the same time he had impressed and frightened Europe by his complete ignoring of all past history, of all racial prejudices, and of all dynastic claims. He was a "new man" without any traditions,

and his schemes had made the old politicians aghast. Yet it was also remembered that the Revolution had been itself the effect of a French literary movement (Voltaire, the Encyclopædists, and Rousseau) which had borrowed its inspiration from English writers, and which spoke of England as the ideal and almost as "the model" of the new France they hoped to establish. England, therefore, though the enemy of France, had been, nevertheless, its spiritual inspiration, "the spiritual home" of the Revolution. Consequently, it is natural (i) that there should be formed a bias in England's favour even in French literature of this period; and (ii) that the rest of Europe, after the Napoleonic collapse, turned to England, and expected to see in her the principles in action which had won the approval of Voltaire and Rousseau and their fellows. England became to discontented peoples a hope and an ally.

Moreover, even the dynastic diplomatists who favoured legitimacy had to admit that England almost alone had retained its monarchy as well as its representative assembly. England alone had remained substantially unmoved by the Revolution; to the foreigner England seemed stable, rich, powerful, and at peace within.

During all this period and its immediately preceding years, two apparently unimportant facts between them gave England its unique chance to develop its political institutions steadily along popular lines; that the earliest George (1714-1727) only spoke German; and that the long reign that filled English history almost from the Napoleonic period to the end of the nineteenth century was the reign of a "queen." Since the first Hanoverian king only spoke German, and since the English aristocracy as a rule spoke none, the King deliberately absented himself from the discussions of the ministers of the Crown. Indeed, Carteret had been chosen chief minister to George I precisely because he was the only minister who spoke German. His knowledge of German enabled him to know what the King wanted and to explain to the King usually what he could not have. The King was at the mercy of his ministers, who kept him as ignorant of what was going on as they could, and who in consequence,

free from royal interference, could govern the country exactly as they wanted to and to suit themselves. George III, (1760-1820) "who gloried in the name of Briton," broke this tradition for a while, but George IV and William IV, who did not take so much interest in politics as did their father, left almost everything to their ministers. When Victoria (1837-1901) came to the throne, she was young and she was a woman; both obvious reasons to that generation why she should be allowed as little say as possible in the direction of the policy of the country.

First, then, the Crown was kept out of politics until, under the *customary* principle of the Constitution (what has not been done by the monarch for a very long time has almost necessarily ceased to be allowable for the monarch to do), it was considered unconstitutional for the monarch to direct political affairs, whether home or foreign.

As a matter of fact, however, at the beginning of this period England was never as contented politically as outside opinion in Europe at that time judged it to be; but as the century advanced, various changes were introduced into the English Constitution which gradually did give England something of the character attributed to her on the Continent.

In 1832 the Great Reform Bill was introduced by the Whigs to transfer the voting power from the landed and agricultural to the industrial and commercial interests, and, in effect, to create the power of the middle class. The working class did not benefit by this particular reform.

In 1829 the Catholics were given a large measure of emancipation after the threats of Daniel O'Connell had secured a hearing for them: by this Catholics were allowed to own property, to have commissions in the army and navy, to practise law, to sit in Parliament, and to exercise their religion in almost perfect freedom.

In 1846 the agitation in favour of Free Trade (the economic principle that to buy in the cheapest market is best) culminated in the conversion of the Tory prime minister, Sir Robert Peel, to the principle of his opponents and his abolition of the Corn Laws.

This was followed by the Chartist movement of the early 'forties which seemed at the time starkly revolutionary; it was so called because it was directed and organised by "a league to establish the People's Charter," and though it was ultimately suppressed, its chief demands have now been granted, viz. universal suffrage, vote by ballot, etc.

Subsequently, the Reform Bill of 1867, introduced by the Conservatives, enfranchised the working man in the city, and the Franchise Bill of 1884, almost at the end of the century, extended the same rights to the agricultural labourer.

But the condition of life in England at a time when the revolting "liberals" in Europe looked to her as their model, was still very hard for the poorer sort. This was the legacy of the *industrial revolution* which had been brought about:

(i) By the introduction of steam, which developed the speed of transport and at the same time enabled machinery to produce articles rapidly enough to keep pace with the new methods of locomotion. Goods could be manufactured quickly and quickly moved to the market centres.

(ii) As a result, home industries fell before the factory system, which introduced a wholly new social organisation of society, dependent upon (a) weekly wages, and (b) constant local employment.

(iii) Since Adam Smith had preached the gospel that men and masters should be left free to settle between themselves without interference the terms of their agreements, the State had deliberately refrained from taking interest in economic bargaining, and the Church of England was too weak and too incurious to trouble herself about the condition of the life of the poor. Hence, a rising class was being bred hostile to the authority of the little-caring State or Church, and growingly discontented with the share of the profits of industry allotted to them.

But to the European rebel or revolutionary, the ideal of England and the secret of her supposed stability and content rested upon her political system, which in their eyes included:

(i) A free assembly, representative of, because elected by, the people.

(ii) A government of the same nationality as the people governed.

(iii) A cabinet of the assembly in charge of the government:

(a) belonging to a single party;

(b) jointly responsible for the policy it proposed or adopted;

(c) generally guided by a first (prime) minister.

EUROPEAN ALLIANCES

Before the Congress of Vienna had finished its labours the Emperor of Russia proposed to the governments of Europe what he called a *Holy Alliance* of all rulers, which was to enforce "The precepts of the Gospel"; this proposal was naturally carried unanimously by the Congress, but immediately smothered as "sublime mysticism and nonsense," two things that were synonymous in the language of that day. In place of the Holy Alliance the Great Powers substituted the *Quadruple Alliance* of Russia, Austria, Prussia and Great Britain, which was deliberately framed to put down the revolutionary spirit that might still be left alive in France. In 1818, France, now ruled by Louis XVIII, and constitutionally stable, joined the Quadruple Alliance, from which Great Britain practically withdrew (though just before that date and just after it laws were passed in England to maintain the price of corn [1816], and to limit [a] the right to hold public meetings and [b] the freedom of the Press [1817-1819]. In 1819 the Peterloo massacre took place, caused by a monster meeting called to advocate reform of Parliament).

But the obvious results of the Napoleonic War were wholly different from what the Quadruple Alliance desired.

In *Spain* and in the Spanish colonies revolts broke out; the constitution granted in 1812 by the Bourbon monarchs, when the nation was defending the monarchy against Napoleon, had been withdrawn after the Congress of Vienna, but it had to be restored by Ferdinand VII in 1820; and the same constitution was demanded by armed force in Portugal and granted by the government in 1820. In *Naples*, too, the secret societies rose against Church as well as State and compelled the new king also to

accept a constitution on the Spanish model in 1820. The Quadruple Alliance was, therefore, summoned by Metternich to send ministers to a meeting at Troppau in October, 1820, and the five Powers (France's entrance and England's nominal attachment made it five) were asked to assist in suppressing these three national outbreaks, and also the rising party of independence which fought for the freedom of the "isles of Greece." Byron died at Missolonghi (April 19th, 1824) seemingly the ambassador of England to the home of freedom. To these repressions England objected, largely for commercial reasons, and France had at first little sympathy with the proposed policy; but the Congress at Laibach (1821) commissioned Austria to deal with Naples, and another Congress at Verona (1822) commissioned France to deal with Spain. France accepted her commission, and both powers were successful in the suppressions which they had been delegated to carry out. Against both these proposals Great Britain had protested but she took no positive steps to prevent them. But in *South America* (where some of the Spanish colonies had revolted) Canning (1770-1827), Britain's Foreign Minister, was more directly successful: he "called a new world into existence to redress the balance of the old." His was the brain that controlled British policy at the time, a wide-visioned statesman, cynical, amusing (his *Anti-Jacobin* is a monument of wit and grave sense), liberal and sincere. He announced in October 1823 to all foreign governments that England would not tolerate any interference in the affairs of America by European Powers. England's navy made his protest unanswerable. In the December of that year President Monroe, of the United States of North America, under the shelter of the British navy, issued the statement of Canning in the form of a personal declaration of his own to Congress. Thus, England gave to the United States of America its most characteristic and its only stable, foreign policy. In virtue of this double declaration, by 1830 the Argentine, Chile, Venezuela, Ecuador and Columbia had become separate and independent States.

In *Greece*, too, though his policy brought him at first into collision with Russia, Canning was able to secure success for the party of independence (through the naval victory of the allies

under Admiral Codrington over the Turks at Navarino in 1827), though it did not come finally till February 1830, after he had died (August 1827). By it Greece was erected into a kingdom, and the throne, after being offered to Leopold of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha (later Leopold I of Belgium, the son-in-law of George IV, whose only daughter, Princess Charlotte, he had married), was given to Otho, second son of the King of Bavaria, who ruled it from 1833 to 1862; he was then expelled by Russia and in his place George of Glücksburg (whose father later became King of Denmark, and of whose sisters one became Empress of Russia and another Queen of England) succeeded. England took the opportunity to cede to the new king the Ionian Isles, the protectorate of which had been lodged with her since the Congress of Vienna.

FRENCH AND BELGIAN REVOLUTIONS

But the year 1830 saw two other revolutions of even greater consequence; the first in France, the second in Belgium. In France, Louis XVIII had been succeeded by Charles X, his brother (1824-1830), who intensified the policy of repression which Louis had been urged to adopt in his later years. The Assembly protested against this illiberal proceeding, and, though in the end Charles began to relax his intensely repressing policy, he did it too late to secure the allegiance of his people. He was deposed and fled to England. The majority of the Assembly offered the throne to *Louis Philippe*, Duke of Orleans, son of that Philippe Egalité, who had fanned the flames of the Revolution after having by his personal excesses helped to produce it, and who had at last been guillotined in the days of the Terror. Louis Philippe accepted the crown, and, to show that his conception of the purposes of the monarchy differed from that of his immediate predecessors, went back to the old title of the French kings, and called himself *King of the French*, and not *King of France*. The style had been altered by Henry IV, to lay stress on his legitimacy; it was changed again by Louis Philippe as a tribute to the new fashions of the democracy. But more important than his title was his minister Guizot (1787-1874), the historian, who

was also a Protestant and whose theoretical liberalism was used by the other politicians to further the interests of the middle class.

One of the results of this was to provoke a revolution in *Belgium*, which had been united with Holland by the Congress of Vienna to form a single kingdom under William of Orange; the Belgians were different in history and in religion from their fellows of the United Provinces, they had been subject to France for twenty years, their culture had little connection with Dutch art or literature, but was partly Flemish and partly French. Moreover:

(i) Numerically larger than the Dutch, they had not as many representatives in the chamber.

(ii) Their Catholic religion had not political equality with the Calvinism of the Dutch.

(iii) Their manufacturers were exploited in the interests of the commercial class in Holland.

In August 1830 the Belgians rose in revolt; in October their revolution was complete; so complete was it that most of the Powers of Europe at once acknowledged the new government on the sole conditions:

(i) That a limited monarchy and not a republic should be its form; and,

(ii) That the candidate whom the Belgians wished to have, Louis Philippe's second son, the later unpopular Duke of Nemours, who had been vetoed by the Powers, should give way to Leopold of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha (cousin of Queen Victoria, because he had married George IV's only child, and uncle because he was her mother's brother) who had already refused the throne of Greece; he was chosen and agreed to accept the crown. It required an armed demonstration of the British fleet off the Dutch shores to force William I of Holland to recognise the new kingdom; and he was all the more unwilling to recognise it when he found that it was to include a portion of the Duchy of Luxembourg, which had been given to him by the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and which he steadily refused to surrender. Ultimately, Luxembourg was divided, so that half went to Belgium to form the province of

Luxembourg and half was given as an appanage to the House of Orange-Nassau. This latter portion was called the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and the succession was limited in such a way that in 1890 it passed away altogether from Holland to the Duke of Nassau. After some hesitation William agreed even to this (1839), but in disgust immediately resigned his throne to his son William II (1840).

PRUSSIA AND TURKEY

In Germany the Prussian kingdom remained the least Liberal of the States; but it had acquired popularity with the others by joining the Zollverein, or Customs Union, which now gradually spread to almost all the States, except Austria. But Prussia's main preoccupation with foreign politics at the moment was in an unexpected direction, which proved to be a permanent attraction for her—the affairs of Turkey. The two Powers of Russia and Austria were also naturally interested in this neighbour of theirs, Turkey. Especially was each particularly watchful of the other, lest it should acquire too great influence in the straggling and vulnerable Ottoman Empire. Of that empire, Egypt, under Mehemet Ali, was in revolt (1832), and Syria had fallen to his arms (1839), when a convention of all the Great Powers (except France) held in London in 1840, decided to maintain against all aggressors and rebels the integrity of the Turkish dominions. A demonstration of their joint fleets in the Eastern Mediterranean, therefore, took place, and produced the desired purpose, for Syria rose in revolt against Mehemet Ali and expelled him. He was allowed to return to his Egyptian principality undisturbed. France had refused to join the Convention of 1840, as she had hoped by supporting Mehemet Ali to secure a predominant influence in Egypt. Now, however, seeing there was nothing else to be done, since Mehemet Ali had been so decisively worsted, she agreed to what the others had accomplished.

SPAIN, PORTUGAL AND ITALY

Meanwhile, both Spain and Portugal had had troubles of their own, in which disputed successions, "pretenders," and Liberal

revolts against reactionary methods of government were the chief incidents. Eventually the famous "Constitution of 1812" was re-established in each, and in each a queen regnant was set up, Maria da Gloria in Portugal and Isabella in Spain. Miguel in Portugal (defeated 1833) had been the supplanting uncle, and Don Carlos in Spain (defeated 1836).

Italy also at this time began to show itself to be the chief problem of the Central Powers, though at first this was as part of the general Austrian problem, Mazzini and Gioberti in Italy, Kossuth in Hungary, Gaj in Croatia, Palacky in Bohemia, all agitating against Metternich, and being met by his determination not to recognise these separate nations within the Austrian Empire.

THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1848—France

No sooner was this stage in the development of Liberal politics in Europe reached than a second series of revolutions began. It started in *France* in 1847, where Louis Blanc with his *Organisation of Labour*, following the Socialist leaders, Fourier and St. Simon, had taken the lead in proposing many changes which Louis Philippe and Guizot would not accept. Guizot, like the rest of the leading politicians of France for another generation, was a historian, and seems to have been so interested in the past days of France that he forgot the future. Guizot would not surrender to the demands of the Liberals, and Louis Philippe in 1848 abdicated and followed Charles X's example in flight to England. No monarchy had any chance now of being set up in France, and a republic was therefore proclaimed.

This refusal to accept a monarchy was at first due to the Socialists, who were opposed to any merely Liberal policy and were determined to enforce their revolution, which certainly does not now seem violently revolutionary; it included:

(a) The right of every workman to work.

(b) The provision, therefore, of public workshops for all.

But when the elections for the assembly were completed it was found that the Socialists had a very small following, and that the Liberals greatly preponderated. The Liberals therefore now

swung loose from their alliance with the Socialists and set up their own government.

The results were:

(i) Fighting between the Liberals and Socialists in Paris and the suppression of the workshops, which had been inaugurated when the Liberals thought they would need the Socialist vote.

(ii) The meeting of the assembly and its manufacture of a new constitution.

(iii) Its election of a president for a term of four years. The president chosen was the Prince Louis Napoleon, son of Louis Napoleon, who had been King of Holland till 1810. The new president's career is illustrative of his period:

1830. He joined the Carbonari and was captured in the Romagna in arms against the Pope.

1836. He headed a revolution in Strasburg against King Louis Philippe, was captured and sent to America; he returned to Europe on receiving the news that his mother, Queen Hortense, was dying, and after her death settled in London.

1838. He published his book, *Les idées Napoléoniennes*, to prove the value of the domestic policy of Napoleon I and to trace the origin of his uncle's aggressive foreign policy to the provocative action of other governments. It was a clever attempt to show his uncle as an idealist of peace who was forced by wicked foreign countries to become a soldier and impose his will on the world.

1840. Taking advantage of the emotions aroused in France by the return of the ashes of Napoleon I, he tried a second time to instigate an insurrection against Louis Philippe, landing in Boulogne for that purpose; but was captured when he was trying to escape after the failure of his plot and this time imprisoned; after five years' imprisonment he escaped from his gaol and returned to England.

1848. He became a special constable in England to support law and order against the Chartists, returned to France when Louis Philippe fled to England, was elected deputy

for five departments, in 1848 sat in the assembly, and on December 10th, 1848, was chosen Prince President of the Second Republic.

Austria and Hungary

In Austria the revolution was considerably more complicated because its German-speaking states wished, not only to ally themselves with the German Confederation, but also to rule the Czechs in Bohemia; and the Hungarian revolutionaries were not content with agitating for a national government for themselves, but were determined to govern the Saxons in Transylvania and the Slavs in Croatia, Dalmatia and Illyria, as subject peoples. All these difficulties in Austria came from its geographical confusion of race, language and religion, for the districts were intermingled and no clear cut division could be made which gave each race, language and religion its own defined territory. Kossuth, however, in 1848, secured a national government for Hungary whereby it acknowledged the Emperor of Austria as its king, but was else independent of Austria; the Czechs and Germans in Bohemia received their charter the same year; and even the diet of Lower Austria was compelled to accept a revolutionary constitution. Troops were called out in Vienna (March, 1848); and in the confusion Metternich followed the example of other unwanted rulers and fled also to England (1848).

But the situation was far too complicated to be solved by merely accepting the demands of the rebels; for the Slavonic diet demanded separation from Hungary, the Czechs refused to accept their fellow German citizens as having part or lot with them, and the Saxons of Transylvania and the Roumanians (the inhabitants of the provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia) called in the Russians to free them from the tyranny of the Magyars of Hungary. This invocation of Russia proved to be the final act. The Hapsburgs joined forces with the Russians against their other subjects and supported the Roumanians against the Hungarians. Thus, Francis Joseph I, the new emperor (his sick and shy father had abdicated in 1848) began his long reign by taking a part in the settlement of his kingdom by playing off one

part of his empire against another. With Russia's help the Hungarians were broken in August 1849.

Prussia

In 1848 even Prussia was reluctantly given by its king a more liberal constitution; and this immediately inflamed the neighbouring kingdoms of Saxony, Hanover (now ruled, not by Queen Victoria but by Ernest, the brother of William IV, since the Salic Law forbidding the throne to women was in force there), and Bavaria, which also, therefore, demanded and received constitutions at the same date. The Liberal statesmen of these and other German principalities met at Frankfort and endeavoured to form a union of all the German States, to secure a common Liberal constitution, but the problems presented to them to be dealt with immediately were too difficult to be settled by the antagonistic parties present. The result was that they separated without achieving anything and with the loss of their prestige.

One of the main problems which the assembled statesmen had been unable to solve had been the quarrel concerning the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein, which had for some time been perplexing German politics. By a royal decree of Christian VIII of Denmark in 1848, the duchies had been united to the Danish Crown; this was opposed by:

- (i) The Germans in both duchies, who were hoping to join the prospective German confederation;
- (ii) The Duke of Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, who had claims at least on Holstein.

Frederick VII who succeeded to the throne on the death of his father, Christian VIII, in that year hoped by granting a constitution to all his people to quiet this agitation, but the Germans in the duchies opposed their inclusion in Denmark even on these liberal times, and revolted against the Danish rule and attacked the royal forces. Then four things happened:

(a) The *German Diet* ordered the Prussian king to support the Germans in the two duchies against the Danes, and in obedience to this he sent General Wrangel to their aid.

(b) The *European Powers* forbade the Prussian king to inter-

fare and were determined to maintain the integrity of Denmark; the king, therefore, recalled General Wrangel.

(c) The *German Parliament* backed up the policy of the diet, forbade Wrangel to leave the duchies and brought in the Austrians to their side by naming the Archduke John (brother of Ferdinand) as regent of the Confederation.

(d) The *Prussian King* refused to obey the Diet or the Parliament and chose instead to follow the direction of the Powers. He withdrew his troops and the duchies lapsed to Denmark.

The re-assertion of the young emperor's power in Austria and his skill in playing against each other the various nationalities under his rule had given the Germans within that empire an increased desire to throw in their lot with the Germans in the whole of Germany, especially when they began to realise the steady increase of the political activities of the Magyars, Slavs and Czechs. They dreaded being swamped by non-German influences in any general assembly of the Empire. Under Schwartzburg, the new foreign minister in Austria, therefore, they appealed to the German States that they might form a single confederation with them. This was refused by the diet at Frankfurt (1848), which feared that it might become burdened with the mixed nationalities of the Austrian rule. The Austrian regent of the Confederation, therefore, resigned and the imperial hereditary crown of United Germany was then offered by the German Parliament to Frederick William of Prussia (April 1849). He promptly refused the offer, since he had no sympathy either with Diet or Parliament, both of which advocated Liberal constitutions totally opposed to his principles.

Italy

The last great revolution of this second series occurred in Italy soon after the election of Pius IX to the Papacy (1846). Gioberti had advocated the federation of the Italian States under the presidency of the Papacy; Pius IX was known to be in favour of the Liberal principles then in vogue and was credited with sympathy for this particular project. He was, therefore, attacked by Austria, which occupied Ferrara in July 1847. The effect of this

occupation was the exact opposite of what Austria had hoped; Naples revolted and secured a constitution from King Ferdinand, and Piedmont was granted one by its king, Charles Albert of Sardinia. These three, aided by Tuscany, declared war on Austria, and endeavoured to drive the Austrians out of Italy. But the three sovereigns were not in fundamental agreement as to what they desired to do when the Austrians should be expelled, and the alliance was fitful and inconsistent. The King of Naples recalled his constitution (1848); the Pope felt uncertain of the purposes of his Sardinian ally; the King of Sardinia could not make up his mind as to what to do with the cities of Lombardy and Venice, which desired to join the Sardinian kingdom. Because of this delay the Austrians had time to recover their forces and reinvaded Italy.

Meanwhile, Mazzini, who had been advocating a policy of the free use of daggers in the south, had secured the assassination of Rossi, the Liberal prime minister of Pius IX, who was stabbed at the entrance to the Parliament (1848). No one present ventured to interfere with the murderers; the session of the Parliament which Rossi was on his way to attend continued its meeting without one expression of regret for what had happened and without even a reference to the murder which had just taken place under its roof. The Pope realised that, not a Liberal constitution, but the forcible suppression of all princes, was the dream of his assembly; he saw this from Gaëta, whither he had fled (24th, November, 1848), and watched the two republics of Rome and Tuscany proclaimed in February 1849. Mazzini had no sympathy either with the hopes of Gioberti or the more practical measures of Sardinia. He was as eager to get rid of Charles Albert of Sardinia as of Pius IX or of the King of Naples. He and his wanted a chain of republics stretching from one end of Italy to the other, and were indifferent as to the means employed in setting them up. Though this was evident to the King of Sardinia, he could not afford to quarrel with Mazzini whose help he needed in the struggle both were pledged to continue against the Austrians. He continued his now unequal struggle, was defeated at Novara (23rd March, 1849), abdicated in favour of his son Victor

Emmanuel, and had to watch Lombardy and Venetia reunited to the Austrian rule. Tuscany was re-established under its grand-duke and the Pope restored to Rome (July 15th)

Thus the second series of revolutions in 1848 had come to little better effect than the first series of 1830; the Austrian group of nations was still under absolutist control, for the Czechs and Slavs had opposed the Magyars and Germans and had reaffirmed their loyalty to the Emperor; the German Confederation was still rather a hope than a fact, since Prussia had refused its leadership and Austria was forbidden an entrance into it; the only accomplished fact towards German unity was the Customs Union, which now included practically all the German States; the kingdom of Naples was back almost where it had been, with its constitution recalled in May, 1848, Sardinia was defeated and depressed and reduced to peace with Austria (August 6th), the Pope was restored and now realised that Liberal politicians were not exactly all they claimed to be, and had revoked his constitution, too (April 1850), while the Grand Duke ruled again in Tuscany; in France, a prince president had come to power, no less powerful and hardly more Liberal than the Orleanist regime he had displaced.

England was, however, still the ideal of these nations that were struggling to win freedom from their rulers, and England, under the guidance of Palmerston, was anxious to help them to achieve these aims at a constitution; a Parliament, a representative government, and a prime minister were the remedies he proposed to give to the distressed populations of the Western world.

NAPOLÉON III

Meanwhile a new ideal became popular in the political world, an ideal not so much of liberty as of unity; its foremost exponent was the President of the French Republic, who lost no time in giving an example of what he meant. He was helped by the action of the Assembly, which was no longer politically united by one ideal, since the Socialist programme, which had previously united it was now no longer accepted save by a discredited opposition. Part of the Assembly now opposed the Republic and de-

clared for the grandson of Charles X, while part refused to accept the principle of universal suffrage (which so much disturbed Queen Victoria), a cardinal principle of the policy of Prince Napoleon. The president, therefore, dissolved the Assembly and appealed to the country for a new constitution, with a president to be elected every ten years (December 1851); he secured his requisite majority in 1851 and then in 1852 carried out his *coup d'état*, proclaimed himself Emperor and appealed to the people to ratify his action. The votes of the people were overwhelming in his favour. He ruled France from then on till 1870, sheltering himself under the title of Napoleon III, implying:

- (a) That he was the heir of the Napoleonic Idea;
- (b) That the little "King of Rome" (died 1832) had been the legitimate ruler of France and was Napoleon II;
- (c) That he himself ruled in virtue both of his heritage and of the vote of his people.

Napoleon III was now determined to dazzle his people as his uncle had dazzled them, not indeed by foreign conquest (for his book had been written to prove that this was forced on France by the provocative action of England and the two emperors and Prussia), but by foreign diplomacy and by assuming a position as the general arbitrator of Europe.

THE CRIMEAN WAR

The succeeding political adventures of Europe till 1870 centred round Russia, Prussia and Italy. *Russia*, which had now regained under Nicholas I (1825-1855) and Alexander II (1855-1881) a strong position (after the uncertain idealisms of Alexander I (1801-1805), had weakened it by his inconsistencies), began to cast about for a definite object for its policy.

Finding other outlets blocked to it and desiring to share in the rising industry and commerce of the West, it now started to force its way westwards and, therefore, directed its attention to Turkey, its easiest outlet to communication with the West. Seeing that Turkey now only existed in Europe by the courtesy (and jealousy) of the Christian Powers, the Emperor Nicholas proposed to England in 1853 that a partition should be

made of its territories in the interest of both these Powers, for England had now come to be looked on as the defender of Turkey and the prime support of its integrity. England refused this proposed partition, and became suspicious when Turkey reported to her that Russia had put in a claim for the protectorate of the Holy Places and of all the Orthodox in the empire.

England suspected that this was the opening move of an engineered quarrel, and urged Turkey to admit the protectorate over the Holy Places but not throughout the whole empire; yet even to admit the claim to a protectorate over the Holy Places was not free from troublesome consequences, since it angered Napoleon III, as France had an immemorial position in the East as *the* Christian nation, and had also claimed since the days of the Crusades to "protect" the Christian shrines. Had not *Frank* and *Christian* been synonymous in the East ever since the wars for the Holy Sepulchre? However, England finally was able to discover a basis of agreement with both Russia and France, and informed Turkey of the proposals she might reasonably make so as to get out of the difficulty of placating Russia and offending France. But a more dangerous question had been raised in Russia's demand to protect the "Orthodox" in Turkey, for, taken in its largest sense, this would have given Russia rights over Greeks, Roumanians, and every type of race within the Turkish border. Seeing that Turkey gave no reply to this part of her demand, Russia invaded Moldavia and Wallachia. Great Britain again proposed to Turkey a way to appease the Russian claims and yet to secure the favourable support of the Powers to her integrity; she therefore urged Turkey to give way on this point also. Turkey, however, refused to submit to the occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia and declared war on Russia (23rd October, 1853); a Russian naval victory at Sinope on the Black Sea (30th November, 1853) raised the alarm of England and France. At once their fleets were despatched to Constantinople. Meanwhile, Austria also ordered Russia to evacuate the occupied provinces, and when Russia obeyed occupied them herself (June, 1854). England and France were now persuaded to make a defensive alliance with Austria and declared war on Russia. At the same time

(September, 1854) they attempted to besiege Sebastopol in the Crimea, and as a preliminary fought their way, at a heavy loss of life, to the positions they needed to dominate the city. After the capture of these heights Sebastopol fell in September 1855, and in 1856, under an Austrian threat of a war of her own, Russia agreed to terms proposed by Napoleon III at Paris and signed the treaty on March 30th:

- (i) The fortress of Sebastopol to be demolished.
- (ii) The Black Sea to be closed to all warships.
- (iii) The navigation of the Danube to be free.
- (iv) Moldavia to include that part of Bessarabia which commanded the mouth of the Danube, and with Wallachia to be under their elected governor or hospodar. In effect, they both elected the same governor, Couza, who was later expelled, (1859-1866) and then in 1866 they elected Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen; he took the title of king in 1881. The two provinces became known as Roumania in 1861.
- (v) The integrity of Turkey was to be guaranteed.

UNIFICATION OF ITALY

A clever move had been made by the King of Sardinia. He allied himself with England and France by the treaty of Turin (26th January, 1855) and took part in the Crimean War—not because the war was of any interest to Sardinia, but because these acts advertised the kingdom of Sardinia and secured public recognition of it as a stable Power in Europe; the king thus gained also the favour of Napoleon III

The effect of this step was seen in 1858, when the Emperor and *Cavour* (the prime minister of Victor Emmanuel and the brains at the back of the Italian *resorgimento*) (1810-1861) met at Plombières and agreed:

- (i) That France would support Sardinia against Austria;
- (ii) That Austria was to be expelled from Italy;
- (iii) That the union of Italy was to be accomplished under the presidency of the Pope.
- (iv) That France was to receive Nice and Savoy as the price of her support.

A quarrel was soon picked between France and Austria (May 1859), France defeated Austria at Magenta (June 1859); immediately the north of Italy flared up in revolt and all now seemed ready for the fulfilment of the third point of the agreement of Plombières. But:

(i) Italian statesmen were now so optimistic that they considered they no longer needed French help; this was so obvious that Napoleon became alarmed.

(ii) Even so, Prussia was afraid that France might grow too strong (it was hardly a generation since the Great Napoleon had died and his power was still remembered), and called in England and Russia to bring pressure to bear on the fighting Powers to prevent Napoleon III gaining too much advantage from the war.

Afraid himself now of the new Italy and afraid in turn of the menace of Prussia, Napoleon agreed to negotiate with Austria and to make peace, with the sole gain to Italy that Lombardy and Parma were to be the only annexations made by Sardinia (11th July, 1859). In disgust Cavour resigned office, but was recalled in 1860; Napoleon (with his eyes on the advantage of some visible success to consolidate his power at home) the next year determined to repudiate his treaty with Austria, and agreed to help Sardinia to an even larger slice of territory, if he could be guaranteed the possession of Savoy and Nice. Though these were the hereditary lands of the royal house of Sardinia, Cavour persuaded the King to agree, on the condition proposed by Napoleon, viz., a plebiscite of the inhabitants of the two districts. Cavour saw to it that the vote was favourable. Napoleon secured, therefore, his half of the bargain, while Sardinia was now allowed to incorporate in its kingdom the additional territories of Modena, Tuscany and the Romagna. By April 1860 all this had been accomplished; and Cavour now turned his attention to the South.

But here he had an initial difficulty, in that the main instrument to hand in destroying the Bourbons of Naples was *Garibaldi*, a valuable and picturesque brigand from Nice, but unfortunately for Cavour (the prime minister of the royal government of Sardinia) a declared republican, whose chief abettor was *Crispi*, the

political organiser of the rebellion, an equally ardent republican. However, Cavour had no time to consider the possible complications that might follow after the insurrection; his main preoccupation was to produce the insurrection first and then trust to his own manipulation of events after the rebellion was over to secure the mastery of Italy for his own Sardinian king. When Garibaldi had proved successful (except for Gaëta and Capua) and proclaimed himself—under English inspiration—dictator (June 1860), Cavour realised he must lose no time. He hurriedly picked a quarrel with the Pope, sent Sardinian troops to occupy the Papal territory, persuaded Victor Emmanuel to take part of the army to the siege of Gaëta, which Garibaldi had begun, but could not complete, and thus achieved without a blow all that he had hoped. What he expected, happened. The King was, after all, a king; so when the King arrived in person, Garibaldi resigned his dictatorship and put his sword at the service of Sardinia. The two forces now amalgamated, Gaëta fell, Sicily and Naples voted for union with Sardinia, and a gathering from all the provinces (except Venetia and Rome) at Turin (February 1861) proclaimed Victor Emmanuel King of Italy. Almost at this moment Cavour died: it was June 1861. Napoleon's troops still held the city of Rome for Pius IX, and Austria still held Venice and the shore of the Adriatic. These were indeed important exceptions to a United Italy; but the new kingdom was now strong enough to take care of itself even in these further ambitions. The real important work had been completed. All that was needed now was the removal of any restraining force from outside, perhaps an Austrian or French difficulty. Prussia saw to it that both these difficulties should arise.

THE AUSTRO-PRUSSIAN WAR

First, Prussia was determined to secure for herself against Austria the headship of the German States. She was forming her international position in a period of strong and unscrupulous statesmen. Cavour was one of the examples of this, Bismarck (1815-1898) another. It was Bismarck who had represented Prussia in the German diet. He had watched the inner politics of the

princes; he had been once compelled to give way under the insistence by Austria on its hereditary leadership of these princes; but he knew now that this leadership was a sham. He proposed, therefore, to expose her weakness as the first step towards assuming for his own country the position which she claimed. He looked about for an opportunity of doing this, and he saw it in the unsettled dispute over the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. After the dispute had been settled temporally in 1848 by the refusal of the King of Prussia to interfere, and his orders to Wrangel to retreat, various solutions had been proposed and accepted, but they had failed to meet the difficulty, the last being that of 1863, when Holstein was surrendered to the German Confederation and Schleswig incorporated in the kingdom of Denmark.

Frederick VII of Denmark was succeeded by Christian IX (1863); the German diet took the opportunity to occupy Holstein in the name of the Duke of Augustenburg, whose father, the nearest male heir both to the throne of Denmark and the duchies, had, however, renounced his claim in 1852. Napoleon III, who wanted, as always, to use every public difficulty to exploit his prestige in Europe, and who was beginning to be thoroughly afraid of Prussia's leadership of Germany, proposed that a European congress should be called to settle the question (1863). Bismarck saw that this would not help Prussia and proposed secretly to Austria, instead, a joint occupation of the duchies till a solution had been reached. In every European congress Austria had always lost, and now, fearing the results of yet another congress, agreed to oppose Napoleon's proposal and support that of Prussia. A joint occupation was therefore undertaken of Schleswig (1864), while Holstein was still occupied, with the repeated approval of Austria, by the troops of the diet for the Duke of Augustenburg. The next year Bismarck persuaded Austria to occupy Holstein and to leave Schleswig to Prussia. Unable to refuse this (once she had embarked on the expedition and had thus publicly approved it), she saw herself sneered at in international opinion for holding Holstein and yet at the same time asserting (as she had done in 1865) that the rightful ruler of it was the Duke of Augustenburg. Caught in this

unfortunate position, she looked round for allies to get her out of it. But Bismarck had been before her.

(i) He had interviewed Napoleon III at Biarritz and scared the Emperor into neutrality (September 1865).

(ii) He had persuaded Italy to join the German Zollverein, from which he had deliberately excluded Austria (April 1866).

Neither of Prussia's neighbours was thus likely to relieve any pressure of war, if war were to come; Austria, now in despair, appealed to the diet to deal with the duchies, since it was the very policy of the diet that she was endeavouring to carry out in insisting against Prussia on the rights of Augustenburg to Holstein. Prussia also appealed to the diet, but for a new gathering of the States and a new constitution of the Confederation. The diet supported the Austrian position; so Prussia declared war on Austria and those states (Saxony, Hanover, Bavaria, Hesse-Cassel, etc) which had voted against her in the diet. Italy saw her opportunity against Austria and joined forces with Prussia. Austria was defeated by Prussia at Sadowa on 3rd July, 1866, but she defeated Italy both on land and sea in June and July. France and Russia proposed to intervene; Bismarck saw that he could gain all he needed at the moment, and refused their intervention. On behalf of the Prussian king, he made terms himself. By the peace of Prague and the treaty of Vienna (1866) as between all these Powers:

(i) Prussia secured both duchies, Hanover, Hesse-Cassel (these had both voted against the Prussian proposal in the diet), Nassau and Frankfort.

(ii) Germany was to be divided into a Northern Confederation and a Southern, separated by the river Main.

(iii) Austria was now to be expelled from these confederations and from the German diet.

(iv) Italy secured Venice and the Quadrilateral.*

Napoleon, afraid of the new Prussian status and anxious to make public show of success (especially as he felt hurt at the way he had been caught by Bismarck and, in the moment of Prussia's

*The name given to the four fortresses of N. Italy, Mantua, Verona, Peschiera, and Legnago.

danger, kept in a position of neutrality), now demanded secretly from Prussia as the price of this neutrality some compensation in the shape of German territory. Bismarck promptly showed the letter to the princes of the Southern Confederation and thus drew them:

(i) To see France as their enemy.

(ii) To see in Prussia their best hope against France.

After seeing this despatch, they at once joined the Zollverein, which now included all the German States.

Moreover, Italy had thus secured the union of the whole peninsula except Rome, which was still occupied by French troops; and the chance of securing even Rome was now at hand.

NAPOLÉON'S FOREIGN POLICY

By this time, during his years of rule from 1852, Napoleon could look back and see that his foreign policy (the purpose of which was to give him prestige in Europe) had secured to his credit the possession of the two provinces of Savoy and Nice, and the glory—such as there was—of the Crimean War; but against these, (i) he had by his management of Italian affairs lost rather than gained, and (ii) he had had to watch the defeat of Austria without being able to take advantage of Prussia's war. Moreover, his old fears for the growth of Prussia seemed now even more amply justified; (iii) the civil war in America (1861-1866) had given him no scope to display his imperial ideas in the New World, chiefly because the English government refused to allow him the chance; (iv) by his excessive demands in *Mexico* he was betrayed into action which at the distance of four thousand miles he was unable to sustain and where he had to see the situation going against him and another public failure of his recorded. The incident began by a repudiation in 1861 by Mexico under President Juarez of the debts owed to France, England and Spain; the three Powers made a joint demonstration in the Gulf of Mexico and were offered terms which England and Spain deemed sufficient. After accepting them these two Powers withdrew from any further action. Napoleon III, who never knew how to compromise with dignity, refused to accept the terms offered,

declared war on Juarez, captured Mexico City, deposed the president, and persuaded the assembly to alter the constitution of the country and to declare the Archduke Maximilian, Emperor of Mexico. This it did in July 1863. Maximilian arrived in Mexico from Europe in 1864, and held a precarious rule till 1865; that year the United States government, in the name of the Monroe doctrine, demanded the recall of the French troops that supported him. When these troops left, the new emperor found himself unpopular and unwanted, and had now to face a revolt led by Juarez, with every advantage on the side of the rebels and none on his. He was caught and shot by Juarez, who quietly resumed the presidency of Mexico without further question. Within a year, therefore, of the collapse of Austria another of Napoleon's ventures had failed. (v) Already his attempts to control the Polish troubles in 1863 had been disallowed by Russia and Prussia. (vi) Again, in 1867 his offer to buy from William III of Holland the portion of the grand duchy of Luxembourg, which had fallen to that king under the agreement of 1839, roused so much antagonism in Germany that the matter was referred to a conference of the Powers in London and vetoed. Once more, therefore, Napoleon had lost.

FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR

The time was now approaching when Bismarck was in a position to lead up to the war which he had long and carefully planned—a war he needed and desired. It was not difficult to pick a quarrel with Napoleon, for, though he had no wish for war, Napoleon was convinced of the efficiency of his troops, and had no fear for the result of a clash of arms. Yet at home he had fallen foul of his Liberal and literary leaders, had imprisoned many of his political opponents in remote dungeons, and was beginning to prepare for a climax in the domestic revolt which had threatened him for some years.

The ostensible cause of the quarrel with Prussia was the succession in Spain. Queen Isabella, after some years of struggle with Liberal revolutionaries, had been driven out of the country in September 1868, and in her place the revolting troops and politi-

cians decided to establish a constitutional monarchy. When this had been settled the Cortes offered the crown to various princes in Europe, who all refused it. Finally, it was offered to Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen (a Catholic branch of the Hohenzollern family). He was allied to both the family of Napoleon and of Prussia, and his elder brother had been elected the Hospodar of Roumania in 1866; it seemed an admirable choice. But Napoleon, who saw in it a move of Bismarck to surround France with hostile governments, vetoed it and demanded from the King of Prussia an assurance that the candidature would be withdrawn. This demand he made through his ambassador, who visited William I of Prussia in person at Ems. The King refused it and telegraphed the result of the interview to Bismarck. Bismarck deliberately altered the telegram so as to make the King's refusal more insolent than William had actually made it, and published this falsified version, presumably in order to inflame French opinion against the Prussians. His manœuvre was successful. French public feeling was aroused, Napoleon III could not guide the storm of outraged national feeling, the Empress was quoted as being in favour of an appeal to arms; on 19th July, 1870, France declared war on Prussia.

By the skilful manipulation of the telegram and thus by making France the aggressor, Bismarck had secured for the side of Prussia the adhesion of the South German and North German States, who had not forgotten Napoleon's claim to "compensation" at their expense as the price of his neutrality in the Austrian War, nor his effort to buy Luxembourg and thus break into the German lands. Austria had no desire to help a France that had not helped her. Russia had only found in Napoleon an enemy; Italy was still smarting under the loss of her two provinces; Denmark had no wish to try another fall with Prussia; Spain was in the throes of her own revolution.

Great Britain refused to do more than offer to mediate, partly because Gladstone was prime minister, partly because Prussia was not looked on as a hostile influence, partly because the Liberals in France had put public opinion in England against Napoleon and his political repressions.

Isolated, ill-equipped, badly led, France fell at once before the scientific advance of Prussia. The French had hoped to attack, but found themselves immediately on the defensive (August 2nd, at Saarbruck), lost battle after battle, and were hemmed in at Sedan by overwhelming forces in a corner that they could not defend and from which they could not escape. Napoleon III was with his army, which was led by Marshal McMahon. He was defeated, and with his whole army he surrendered on September 2nd, within six weeks of the declaration of war. A proposal of peace was made by the captured emperor, but Prussia demanded the forfeiture of Alsace and Lorraine, and the assembly in Paris, which now had authority, refused to accept this price. Instead:

(i) Napoleon was deposed and a republic re-established under Gambetta.

(ii) The defence of Paris was feverishly attempted by the republic, hoping in vain for a recovery of that military ardour which had been inspired by Carnot under the First Republic.

The army of Marshal Bazaine, shut up in Metz, now surrendered (October 23rd) and its investing Prussian forces were set free to march on Paris by converging lines. Now, for a short spell, the French did actually show some signs of their old fighting genius; but it was too late. Thiers, Napoleon's late minister, sought to enlist foreign Powers in a joint intervention without success. Then Gambetta, the president of the new republic, escaping out of Paris by a balloon, tried to raise armies in France; but he was not a Carnot, and he failed. The siege of the city went on. On December 2nd the King of Bavaria proposed that the title of German Emperor should be again offered to the King of Prussia. This time it was accepted. So, on the 18th of January, 1871, in the palace of Versailles, in the Hall of Mirrors, the German Empire was proclaimed and the King of Prussia greeted with the title of Emperor. Bismarck's long-prepared scheme had come to its successful end.

That same month (January 30th), Paris surrendered and the Germans made their solemn entry into the city. Immediately after, however, the troops withdrew to the hills outside. On 10th May, 1871, the concluding treaty was signed in Frankfort.

(i) France ceded to the German empire all Alsace (except Belfort) and that part of Lorraine which included Strasburg and Metz.

(ii) France was to pay five milliards of francs as an indemnity (£200,000,000) gradually over a period of five years.

(iii) Germany was to evacuate French territory in proportion to the payment of the annual instalments of the indemnity.

Actually, the whole sum was paid in March 1873, exactly two years after the peace had been signed. The pride of the French and the eloquence of their speakers and their preachers in the churches had collected the money so as to settle as quickly as might be the debt to Prussia, and thus to prevent the hated Prussians remaining longer than need be on French soil. The gold was carefully stored by Prussia at Spandau, to be ready to be drawn upon in the event of any further war. It remained in that fortress till 1914.

RESULTS OF FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR

There were various results of this war other than the unification of Germany.

(i) Russia repudiated her agreement not to bring warships into the Black Sea (October 1870).

(ii) Italy possessed itself of Rome and the Papal States, when the French troops withdrew from Rome to defend France at the outbreak of war, and the Papal Zouaves, defenders of the Papacy drawn from all over the Catholic world, were defeated; Pius IX refused to defend the city at further cost of life, a breach was made in the walls near the Porta Pia on the 20th of September 1870, and Victor Emmanuel entered the new capital of his kingdom, excommunicated, but at the head of a politically united people.

THE THIRD REPUBLIC

(iii) France, when the war was over, lay at first stupefied and then rose in frenzy. In 1848 Napoleon III had entered into power as the symbol of the triumph of the Moderates over the Socialists; at his fall the old flames of the insurrection burst out

anew. An assembly (1871, February 2nd) at Bordeaux (the seat of French governments whenever they have been afraid of Paris) voted the peace (February 26th), and then proceeded to draw up a new constitution; Paris protested. The assembly moved to Versailles; Paris rose (March 18th). Meanwhile, on the conclusion of the peace with Germany, the French army came back and was used by Thiers (elected president August 31st) to hold down the Paris mob. The war of the commune followed, desperate, bloody and pitiless. In the end the commune was destroyed. But the Archbishop of Paris had been shot. It should be remembered that one of the mayors of Paris in revolt, a young revolutionist, bore the name of Georges Clemenceau. He had been one of the most bitter of the communists. Like his kind, he hated the middle class, the monarchy and the Church. The assembly sat for five years, and eventually drew up a constitution (February 1875); it declared for a republic and elected Marshal McMahon to be first president of the Third Republic for seven years. The majority desired a monarchy, but were divided between the Legitimists and the Orleanists: their rivalry and the refusal of the Bourbon line to accept the tricolour blocked the efforts of the majority. The republic was accepted as a compromise which only a few desired for its own sake.

THE GERMAN EMPIRE

(iv) Germany had meanwhile accomplished its unity and now stood for the modern State:

(a) A federal government of a peculiar type in which legislative centralisation was combined with administrative decentralisation.

(b) The centre of gravity lay in a body representing the States, in which Prussia had controlling influence and a veto on important matters.

(c) It was not a confederation of States with equal rights, but of privileged members, in which Prussia had the general management, subject to a limited restraint by her associates.

(d) Hence, it depended for its smooth working on the

strength of Prussia to take the lead and keep the main guidance without occasioning jealousy. This precedence of Prussia was not essential to the empire; any other State might have aspired to the position. But it was essential that one State should be able to infuse vitality into the emperorship and to control the Bundersrath (or Council of States) which had supremacy over the administration.

EUROPEAN ALLIANCES

The new policy of Germany was evident as soon as the war was finished. Bismarck proposed, as his new scheme of governing Europe, a plan not unlike the Quadruple Alliance after the Napoleonic war. He proposed that the three emperors should proceed to govern Europe and the world.

But this scheme did not work out quite so smoothly as Bismarck had anticipated, for the Balkans were a perpetual menace both to Austria and Russia, where Russia took itself for granted as the big brother of all Slav countries, and Austria insisted upon its long-continued hegemony of all the provinces that broke loose from the Turk. Moreover, Russia, which had declared war on Turkey had been blocked in 1877 in her occupation of Constantinople by England and Austria, and had not been supported by Germany against this interference. She remembered this and grudged any peaceful co-operation with these States.

Her bitter feelings against Austria in the Balkans, therefore, drove Russia out of the proposed triple league of empires (1873); Italy took her place instead, driven into it by a fear of France, for (i) Italy had designs on territory opposite to her in Africa, but France had determined to hold to all she could of the north shore of Africa against every other nation; also (ii) the Italian royal government, being afraid of its subjects, who always threatened revolt, wanted to have support from outside in the event of a revolution. It was clear to it that this imperial league would certainly be on the side of the government against the people. In 1883, therefore, Italy joined the Triple Alliance. The dream of a free united Italy had thus only half come true. She was united. She was hardly free.

France and Russia, differently rejected or despised by the Triple Alliance, were inevitably driven into closer relations with each other; they both were faced by an alliance of unfriendly governments whose territories touched the length of their frontiers; they each saw that only in the pressure of the other on the Powers that lay between them was there any military hope of aid. In 1891, therefore, this alliance was formed, and the West thus became divided into two camps, the Triple and the Dual Alliances. Towards the Dual Alliance of France and Russia England reluctantly found herself inevitably drifting, since, though she had little sympathy with France or Russia, she had no lot or part with the Triple Alliance, its policy or its desires. She found herself indeed positively repelled by the Triple Alliance:

(i) In the Boer War (1899-1902) William II, the new emperor (1888-1918), had openly proclaimed his sympathy to be with the republics.

(ii) His naval scheme was a direct challenge (1900) to the supremacy of England on the sea, and the one point in the foreign policy of successive English prime ministers that never faltered was their fixed determination to allow no equality, or anything approaching it, of naval strength between any other country and their own.

ENGLAND

Yet, though England felt more sympathy with France and Russia than with the Triple Alliance she still preferred to be free of all alliances and go her own way.

She had built up a great industrial state and had possession of the markets of the world. Her strength lay in her conditions:

(i) Because of her inventions in machinery, etc. The spinning-jenny, the first cotton-spinning factory worked by steam, and the first steam-engine were all invented between the age of Rousseau and of Waterloo.

(ii) Because of her years of uninterrupted peace at home that allowed her a consistent policy of expansion.

(iii) Because her system of Free Trade had benefited her so long as she had no rivals who could invade her home markets with their freely-imported goods.

(iv) Because her increased devotion to humanitarian principles at the moment when Socialism was breaking out fiercely everywhere else had prevented her from being entirely reactionary.

(v) Because of her shipping, which made her the carrier of the world's trade.

(vi) Because of her scattered possessions, which, though they were little helped by the home government, were at least but little interfered with and which claimed the service of her trade. Canada had been granted self-government in 1840; Australia in 1856; New Zealand in 1875. There were revolts in Canada, but these were settled by the establishment of the Dominion in 1867.

(vii) Because England was still a religious nation, and the government was not in antagonism with the religious beliefs of the people, as happened often elsewhere.

It was the one failure of Bismarck that he had committed his government to an attack on the Catholic Church, under the impression that the Papal position reached after the definition of its infallibility at the Council of the Vatican in 1870 was incompatible with national sovereignty. After a severe struggle with the Papacy, he realised that his Protestant outlook had misled him into a misconception of the doctrine and an unnecessary conflict. Gladstone very nearly did the same thing in England. He was restrained by his friends from more than violence of expression. But also the Tractarian Movement had meanwhile saved England from the extreme narrowness of its older position; this Tractarian Movement was part of that spirit of Victorian compromise which saved, not England only, but Europe, all through this age.

It was an age of transition from the sharp antagonism of the opposing forces of autocracy and revolution, which had been in some measure met by the magnificence of Napoleon I. By his foreign conquests he disturbed, but also he distracted Europe.

During the era of his troubled wars he liberated the spirit of nationality and prepared for his own overthrow.

The heir to his influence was the government of England, and the government of England was Queen Victoria, a girl, a woman, who had, perforce, to depend, more than a man would have done, on her ministers and who yet could command a sympathy or loyalty which kings at the period did not usually command. Partly by design, partly by natural temperament, partly by the accident of the character of Palmerston, partly by the brilliance of Disraeli pitted against and neutralising the moral seriousness of Gladstone and preventing it from stampeding for long the national conscience of Great Britain, partly by the short-lived German orderliness of Prince Albert that left its mark on England, modified by the medium through which it was passed on (*viz.*, the impulsive, narrow and dignified character of the Queen), partly by a combination of little wars under competent generals and large administrative organisation under public-spirited and uncorrupted governors which followed these wars, partly by the Tractarian Movement, the social measures of Lord Shaftesbury and of others, the Elementary Education Act of 1870, and the humanitarian spirit of the contemporary masters of English literature—through the long reign of Victoria a general spirit of compromise infected through England the dreams, however violent, of autocrat or revolutionary elsewhere.

IRELAND AND O'CONNELL

But one aspect of this long reign was concerned with the relationship of England to its dominions, and especially of Ireland. Here, the first great statesman to be encountered in Victoria's reign in Ireland was O'Connell, a lawyer with a burning enthusiasm, and already before she came to the throne the most powerful political leader in these islands. Born in 1775 (and, therefore, in his boyhood familiar with the distress of '98), he declared that he had learnt from that struggle:

- (i) A disbelief in physical force.
- (ii) A hatred of the French Revolution.
- (iii) A distrust of all secret conspiracy.

His method, therefore, consisted of agitation, open and as violent as possible, without bloodshed. His instruments were to be the priests who had so far only reluctantly, and on the side of the government, entered into Irish politics; he was, therefore, opposed to the granting of Emancipation, if it implied as an essential condition a right of veto vested in the English government over the appointment of the bishops in Great Britain. This principle of a government veto was accepted, however, by many of the Catholics in England and Ireland, by the delegate of the Pope, and by the Papal secretary, though not by the Pope himself. O'Connell denounced this proposal and preferred to split his party rather than accept it. The English Parliament, and especially its chief leaders (as Wilberforce), were agreed in undertaking to accept a definite scheme of Emancipation which did contain it; but O'Connell would not surrender his point and preferred that his "Catholic Board" should be suppressed by the government with the approval of Grattan rather than consent to what he foresaw was a mischievous and dangerous proceeding.

His opportunity came when George IV visited Ireland (1821), for though George as Regent, after pledging his support to the Catholics, had withdrawn that support when he was in a position (as Regent) to make it practical, he was now welcomed in Ireland by O'Connell and was impressed by the loyal demonstrations organised in his favour.

O'Connell saw that it would be a better move for him to aim at a wider organisation and a wider appeal than he had hitherto contemplated, and to adopt as his policy the popular cry for parliamentary reform, in which the Catholic disability was to be added only as one grievance out of many that needed a remedy. He appealed, therefore, now to the whole country, Protestant and Catholic alike; he asked indeed specifically from Catholics one penny a month from each parish through the local priest, but his object in doing this was as much to bring the influence of the priest to bear in the movement as to collect funds for it. He wanted to bring the priest into his wholesale agitation. By 1825 this organisation had become a formidable affair, under Catholic protection, and though wholly democratic,

yet supported by the peers and landowners. There were riots in Dublin, and characteristically a bottle was thrown at the lord lieutenant in a theatre; but the grand jury threw out bills against the rioters and O'Connell; and the government in England (in the person of Canning) was not unsympathetic with the agitation. A Bill in favour of Catholic Emancipation was again introduced into the House of Commons (1826), was passed into the House of Lords, and thrown out by forty-eight votes under the leadership of the Duke of York, the last effort of the House of Hanover.

The Moderate Party in Ireland now went over to O'Connell's side, and the election of 1826 showed for the first time in Irish history the peasant voting steadily under the direction of a national leader. It was the proof of the wisdom of O'Connell in directing a popular campaign in favour of reform, as part of which came Catholic Emancipation. He was the first politician who relied entirely on the policy of popularising his programme and organising the popular vote. At Waterford, even the Beresford candidate was beaten, and O'Connell's candidates came out everywhere at the head of the poll. Fear of civil war now shook the determination of the government to continue its opposition, and a knowledge that it was only the restraint of O'Connell that prevented violence and bloodshed drove the government to be careful in their handling of the agitator himself. In 1827 the situation was violently fluctuated by the news of the deaths of the Duke of York and of Lord Liverpool, the prime minister, who had both opposed the Catholic Emancipation Bill. Canning succeeded as prime minister, and he was known as a supporter of O'Connell's demands. At once, Wellington and Lord Eldon, who were members of the government, resigned. Then within three months Canning died, and Wellington and Peel returned to power. The hopes of the Emancipators fell, frenzy revived, and O'Connell in 1828 was elected for Clare against a Fitzgerald. His cause from that moment was gained. Wellington dared not face an unending struggle against a people free to exercise their votes, and the next year *Emancipation came* (1829).

By his creation of his democratic association O'Connell had

defeated the Crown, the House of Lords, the English Church and the Dissenters, the anti-Popery public feeling, the Tory Party headed by Wellington, and the Catholic Emancipation Parliamentary party itself.

When this new Act had been carried, O'Connell now set himself to achieve a further political instalment of reform, *the repeal of the Union*. This proved his undoing. His reputation in 1829 was enormous; when he died (1847), he died in gloom and failure. Yet he could hardly have acted other than he did.

(i) He had never pretended that Emancipation was his final end.

(ii) The country was in such ferment that, had he gone out of the struggle, the chances of the extremists capturing his organisation would have been great; and it would have been difficult for him to have retained any restraining influence, had he given up the agitation for repeal.

(iii) There was an immense number of grievances which seemed likely to be removed only by an Irish parliament, such as tithes, education, land law, etc.

So he now went forward with this new project, using the same weapons as before—petition, associations, monster meetings, and the Catholic penny rent. But this time he failed:

(i) English Whigs and Tories who had supported Emancipation were opposed to the repeal of the Union, for they had voted for Emancipation precisely because they thought it would have consolidated the Union. They were bitterly disappointed at the turn of events, and considered themselves tricked by O'Connell. Lord Melbourne's dictum summed up the judgment of most: "All the clever fellows were on one side and all the d . . . d fools on the other, and the d . . . d fools were right."

(ii) The Irish Protestants had supported Emancipation under the impression that the new Catholic members would be submerged in an English parliament; the idea of a dominantly Catholic parliament filled them with dismay. Even O'Connell's brother turned against him.

(iii) The Repeal party was split in 1844 into—

(a) The *Federalists*, advocating a subordinate Irish parliament with Irish members also sitting in the English parliament. This policy was taken up by O'Connell, of course only as an instalment of the Repeal which he hoped to obtain piecemeal. But his favouring this side lost him the confidence of the out-and-out Repealers, who said he had betrayed his trust.

(b) The *Nationalists* ("Young Ireland"), who were opposed to O'Connell on the method to be used for the agitation, for they were pledged to force. O'Connell's phrases ("No human revolution is worth the effusion of one single blot of human blood." "It is no doubt a very fine thing to die for one's country, but, believe me, one living patriot is worth a whole churchyard of dead ones") made his co-operation with Mitchell, Davis and Duffy, etc., impossible.

When the Whigs were in power O'Connell favoured the Federalists' solution, and when he did so the Nationalists flared up against him. When the Tories were in power he inclined to the whole-hearted repeal of the Nationalists, and this weakened his cause. He died in 1847 (May 15th) at Genoa, with famine, disorder, and coercion rampant everywhere in Ireland, and in the knowledge that he had definitely failed, but also confident that the Young Ireland party would equally be bound to end in failure. He guessed the issue of 1848. But

(i) he was the first Irish statesman of European fame; he took his place in the Liberal (politically) Catholic movement in Europe, and made his Irish propaganda part of the general democratic movement of the West. Thus, he brought "the Irish question" into the foreign politics of Europe. At his requiem in Paris, Lacordaire preached his funeral oration in the presence of a vast audience and to the applause of Montalembert.

(ii) O'Connell was an ardent supporter of absolute religious toleration, in favour of its full extension to dissenters, and of the admittance of Jews to Parliament. He protested against a

Protestant soldier being punished for irreverence at a Catholic ceremony.

(iii) He was never a revolutionist; he hated force; he denounced the Chartists; after the accession of Victoria he spoke of his great love for the English crown.

THE VICTORIAN COMPROMISE

O'Connell was, therefore, one of the foremost of a political type that prevailed under the Victorian compromise, which advocated democracy by sheer agitation, believing it could achieve its aims by constitutional means. The various reform Bills, by broadening the basis of the qualifications of the voter, were intended to make this possible, and this, too, was the consistent hope to be gained by each successive scheme for extending the suffrage. The purpose of this type of politician was to enable a country to make changes in its constitution without revolution, and to take away from government the power and the chance finally of resisting generally decided reforms.

It is not to be supposed that any such perfect scheme had been achieved early in the century, or that in England there was not a great deal that was distressing, unjust, illiberal, and hostile to the spirit of Christ. The novels of Dickens and of Disraeli (neither of them extremists) are patent evidences to the contrary; the heavy disquisitions of Mill, the violent exhortations of Carlyle and Ruskin (not violent beyond reason), the speeches of Gladstone, Cobden and Bright, prove this to the hilt. But it is evident that the trend of English example and its general success in affording an outlet for genuine reform did modify the activities of European excess towards autocracy or revolution, and did uphold steadily another ideal.

It is pathetic to see how English institutions became the fashion, and, indeed, the accomplishment of nations to whom they were foreign and unnatural things. Though the parliamentary system was no doubt older in Spain than in England, it had ceased to have a continuous history there; in England it had grown up with the growth of national life; it was natural, traditional, part of the habit of thought of the country, part of its

literature and accustomed ways. But on the Continent it was supposed that it was this parliament all by itself that had made England what it was at that date, politically freer than its neighbours, richer, apparently more contented. It was forgotten that it was really the other way round. It was not parliament that had made England, but England that had made parliament what it was—fitted it to become the expression of the vocal part of the State. Hence there came into Europe at this time the infectious custom of creating parliaments everywhere, which was in the end to produce disillusionment; and when, after parliaments had failed, and the nations to whom they were foreign abolished them, the "Liberal," mistaking the means for the end, fell into the error of supposing and saying that freedom had been violated because parliament had been suppressed. But the parliamentary system was only one way of giving a nation a chance to express itself. It was not, however, the only way; at times it might not be a way at all.

The Victorian compromise, as far as England was concerned, and as far as Europe was able to establish it, really meant the rule of the middle class; it was not the rule of the people by the people, but the rule of the people by the middle class. Gladstone, the Liverpool merchant, carrying his Lancashire accent to the grave, was the truer representative of that age than Disraeli, who had none of the prejudices nor the sanities of his rival, yet, being more detached and aloof from it, he saw his age more clearly than his rival did. Gladstone's attempts to deal with Ireland, with the Boers, with the Egyptians, were perhaps doomed to failure, and were perhaps in part unwise; but they did represent the idealism of the middle class and the hopes of the people as Tennyson sang them—quiet, simple, commonplace, Victorian, combining a policy of freedom with a refusal to see the real sorrows of the poor. It appealed to the Commons, but neither to the Peerage nor the poor. It was quite definitely a compromise, almost a pretence.

Disraeli was the truer critic of his age, because he was a prophet, but thereby he was less representative of it. A prophet is always free of the taints of his age. Parnell (1846-1891), the

Irish leader, was far less able to understand the compromise, for he was more practical and less given to compromise; the Mahdi and the Boers took it to be conscious weakness; even Gladstone seemed at times not quite sure whether or not he believed in it himself. He had his moments of distrust. At these times, being thoroughly of his age, he took refuge in Homer and the Bible; not translating Homer as the older generation could have done, but defending the traditional view of one single poet against the critics of his time: even so, his thesis was not quite traditional, yet neither did it accept the theories of the critics; it compromised with both.

ENGLISH RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS

His Bible-defence was equally a compromise; it followed the line of his type of thought. The religion of the age was of the same compromising character. Said Huxley of Dean Stanley, after his visit to the Holy Land as philosopher and guide to Albert Edward, Prince of Wales: "He believed everything in Scripture of which he had seen the supposed site. He only did not believe in creation because he had not been there." The intellectual classes no longer accepted the old-fashioned Protestant religion, and yet could not cut out of their creed all that their new theories, logically developed, properly necessitated. The Victorians "distrusted logic" in religion, which really meant that they distrusted the conclusions ruthlessly implied in so much of what they did definitely now accept. Again, to Dean Stanley of Westminster, whose "Broad Church" doctrines made him unwilling to be very sure of anything in the Creed, Disraeli shrewdly pointed the honest conclusion of such a mental and religious standpoint: "No dogma, no dean." If there be no doctrine, there can be no Church. The Evangelists, or old-fashioned Protestants, clung to their emotional devotion to the person of Christ Our Lord, and tried to close their ears to the persistent wittling down by the critics of the rationalistic basis of this personal belief; while the High Church party (whose doctrines had been popularised by the Tractarians) had a hard fight to acquire a status in the Church under the prayer-book formularies, and at times

suffered persecution under the law. Characteristically, Queen Victoria deplored this persecution as contrary to the spirit of the English Church. She disliked these ways of belief and ritual, as she had never been taught in her earlier years how to work them into her standard of faith; yet in the end, with an instinctive understanding of the middle class, she deprecated the forcible suppression of the ritualists since this implied some absolute standard of religious doctrine which was foreign to the spirit of her reign.

In 1845 Newman (1801-1890) had become a Catholic—the signal for the beginning of that movement in the Church of England that drifted steadily to Rome. Pugin (the revivalist of Gothic architecture) had a few years earlier left his French Huguenot traditions to become a Catholic. The movement, therefore, showed in art as well as in creed, a tendency to go back behind the Reformation and to start afresh from the fourteenth century. Gothic came back into fashion with a swing that had been prepared for by Horace Walpole in the middle of the previous century, who had inaugurated at Stanberry Hill an antiquarian interest in the ages which till then polite literature had considered Gothic, i.e., barbarious and without taste. The writings of Scott (1771-1832) had also helped forward this fashion by his skill in investing with romance and mystery the characters of medieval history, the ruins of religious houses and abbey churches, and even the social life of those times. The historians, too—Freeman, Green, Froude, Stubbs and Maitland—hammered home their new view of the Catholic past of England, and made it show up in noble contrast to the squalor of the late times, while Macaulay, despite his metallic prose, brilliant and facile, had, as became a lover of the classics, inspiration enough to see in the Catholic Church not merely something romantic (which would not have tamed his hereditary dislike of it), but something useful and abiding; for him it was the Church which had civilised the natives of Paraguay, which had produced Innocent XI whose foreign policy agreed with that of his hero, William III of England, and which would certainly outlast even the ruins of St. Paul's.

But against this tendency to romanticism was a *growing interest in science*, in which the Victorian age also exulted. Science came not merely as an abstract and austere discipline of thought, but as a practical help to industrial invention, and therefore was justified by the wealth it brought and the education it improved. Partly this science was itself the outcome of the industrial revolution, the new ways of dealing with iron-ore and coal, partly it had come independently of this through the influence of Newton and of Descartes (the philosopher of France), partly it had arisen from the theory of evolution or development which had also been defended in France by several scientists, had been described in graceful English by Newman in his *Development of Doctrine* (published 1845), and still further elaborated with reference to human origins in *The Origin of Species* by Darwin (1809-1882) in 1857. This last writer broached a particular form of the theory which roused the bitterest controversial feelings—namely, the suggestion that man and the ape had a common ancestor, not yet known. At first considered to deny the doctrine of a divine creator and then the belief in the spiritual nature of the soul, this theory was denounced as subversive of the Christian revelation; many of the defenders of the theory were equally insistent with its opponents in agreeing to this, that there was a sharp and fundamental antagonism between Christianity and the newest scientific hypothesis. Disraeli quizzed its pretensions, the Duke of Argyll elaborately criticised it, Bishop Wilberforce blunderingly misinterpreted it; Huxley and Alfred Wallace joyously defended it, though modifying the original theory in certain respects. Thus the war of Darwinism, opening vehemently, steadily went on.

In *literature*, the age developed from the naturalism of Wordsworth and the common-sense optimism of Dickens into later phases of careful and artificial diction and a deliberate pessimism; but these were the signs of the break-up of the Victorian age and of its complacent acceptance of wealth, activity and material comfort as the tests of civilisation, of which the supreme and flaunting manifestation was the international exhibition in Hyde Park in 1850. It opened with *Hearts of Oak*, the *British Grenadiers*, and the *Girl I left behind me* as the popular songs of the Napoleonic

wars in England; it ended in England with *Come into the Garden, Maud* and *Champagne Charlie* as the popular songs of the Victorian peace, and its Crystal Palace symbolically made of cast iron and uncoloured glass. The Victorian devotion to duty was visible in its art in England, France and Germany, in its heavy and unadorned architecture, in its solid furniture, even in its monuments in the streets. But it had this quality about it, that it was the age of iron in architecture. It was the age of the engineer, i.e., of buildings to be set up speedily, but still with the old idea of enduring value; not yet with the idea of unsettlement and a short life.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS OF EUROPE

The history of Europe was not all this time a quiet progress towards peace; but between 1870 and the end of the century there were no European wars. The Third French Republic, governed by a president (who was to hold office for seven years and to be elected by a joint meeting of the two legislative assemblies), was not stable enough to engage in any aggressive foreign policy; France had been eliminated temporarily as a public force in European politics. Even internally, at home, her republican form of government had only been chosen because "it divided men least." It was the compromise that suited, only as a second best, and it therefore failed at first to provoke enthusiasm. After some years, however, the enthusiasm came.

But the form of government as actually constituted contained an element that was opposed to Catholicism (the religion of the majority); it had its roots in freemasonry, and freemasonry chose to see the Catholic Church as its enemy. In this, therefore, France and Italy pursued a parallel course. They suppressed, not Catholicism only, but even Christianity; from education the name of God was to be left out. In spite of the steady example set by England against such an attitude to religion, this policy prevailed. In *Italy*, of the two, this was perhaps more understandable, seeing that the Papacy had been politically dispossessed by the government, and was naturally hostile to the action of the government in dispossessing it, and had excommunicated it. The excommunicated king consequently made no very ostenta-

tious effort to restrain the persistent insults showered on the august head of the Catholic Church by noisy politicians; gradually, however, the prestige acquired by Leo XIII (1878-1903) (the successor of Pius IX) as statesman and thinker began to inspire amongst his fellow Italians a pride in their Pope. He had shown himself to be intelligent enough to out-manceuvre Bismarck, and strong enough to refuse to be bullied by Prussian bluff.

But, while an explanation can be found for the Italian anti-Christian policy, France had no such excuse. In a country which had become weakened by a disastrous war and where, therefore, the need for a close unity of the people was of the gravest necessity, successive governments deliberately antagonised a very large section (and that, too, the most conservative and constitutional) of its people; both in 1880 and 1900 the Church was penalised, the religious expelled, Catholic schools closed, and all official connection between the republic and the Christian religion severed.

At this time *Germany* also had its problems to face; not least its domestic troubles. Socialism had found its great exponent in a German, Karl Marx, who published his *Das Capital* in 1867; under the conditions of the time he had to leave Germany and come to England, and he lived in London, where he met and quarrelled with Mazzini. But his influence was greater in his own country even than abroad. However, Bismarck's method of dealing with it was enlightened and at first successful; he forestalled its propaganda by himself introducing social reforms into Germany of a far-reaching character, and gave the initiative to the governments of other countries to follow the same lines. Old age pensions and government insurance were, for instance, measures introduced at this time into Germany by Bismarck in his effort to outbid Socialism in its appeal to the working man. But yet the movement could not really be curbed—it could only be opposed; in spite of this stealing of its programme, it steadily increased. The date, however, which marks the most important stage in the change of German policy, was 18th March, 1890, that on which William II came to the throne and dismissed Bismarck. The old statesman had grown in wisdom and also in his deter-

mination to use it. This irritated the young emperor, who was quite sure of himself and of his capacity to inaugurate and carry out home and foreign policies. He was equally determined to allow no one to rule but himself.

Austria, now in alliance with Germany, had too its continuous problems to deal with, arising from its bundle of nationalities with their individual liberties and their mutual relations, comprised in a single empire that was only geographically held closely together. The frontiers of these separate races touched, which occasioned opportunity for "incidents" and yet they were supposed to be protected by a common law. Of all the nationalities of the group, the Hungarians seemed the most contented, having their separate monarchy, which was merely joined to Austria through the person of their emperor-king. But the disturbing factors were the Czechs and Slavs, who clamoured for their "home rule", and for their right officially to use their language and to discard the German tongue, which they looked on as the badge of their subjection; thus, one of their demands was to have the names of the streets written up in their own spelling and tongue. But in so far as she touched the rest of Europe, the main project of Austria was (i) to secure a greater position in the Balkans, where, on the whole, her rule was well-liked and humane; and (ii) to push forward the project of a railway going direct to the East, and so obtain a larger share than she had in the commerce of the East, and eventually to own a great trade route down which were to pass the goods of East and West. At last the railway between Vienna and Constantinople was constructed; an extension of the line was then proposed between Scutari, the port of Albania, and the far off central city of Asia—Bagdad. Germany was a continual inspiration in this Eastern policy, and the scheme was to be a joint adventure, partly political to give the two emperors a dominating position in directing and perhaps inheriting the dominions of Turkey, partly commercial, to provide markets for the manufactures of both empires. Both governments thus were turned for their development to the South and East.

The domestic problems of *Russia* were due to her retention of the form of autocracy. The slaves, or serfs, had been emanci-

pated by Alexander II between 15th January, 1858 and 3rd March, 1861: but there the reforms halted, and the intellectual classes (especially in the universities) became revolutionary as they saw how autocracy was bound up with corruption and inefficiency. For long the fashionable revolutionary cult was called Nihilism, or the destruction of all government. Its ideal was complete anarchy, violent terrorism (from 1878 onward) being used as the method by which to break down the opposition of the Court. Alexander II was murdered in 1881, but his successor, Alexander III met ruthless terrorism with ruthless terrorism, drove Nihilism abroad or underground, and eventually broke its power to do hurt. But this meant little more than it became a European disease instead of merely a Russian one. Everywhere Anarchist clubs were formed. Political assassination became almost more prevalent in the later half of the nineteenth century than ever before in Europe; it seemed as though the old paganism had returned. Violence was now an international remedy, preached by the intellectuals, who were impatient with the slow "evolution" of the social utopias they had taught.

In her foreign politics Russia was concerned with designs on *Turkey*, and especially, as in the days before the Crimean War, with claiming the patronage of the Orthodox or Slav subjects of the Sultan as a method of interfering. An opportunity for the successful use of this came when various provinces, including Bulgaria (1876), revolted from Turkish authority, and these revolts were vigorously suppressed by the Turks with every method of frightful barbarity, beatings, torture, murder and massacre. The news of this "frightfulness" reached Europe, but Russia alone, besides protesting, moved to interfere. She took Bulgaria under her protection, and marched into Turkey to insist upon her protests having direct force. Ever since the reign of Catherine II, who had had one of her sons called Constantine, the dream of Russia had been to occupy Constantinople and to bring to life the old dead Empire of the East.* War was

*It should be remembered that Zoe, daughter of the last Emperor of Byzantium (Constantine XI, killed in the siege of Constantinople 1453) took refuge in Russia in 1472, married Ivan III, and changed her name to Sophia. It is because of this marriage and inheritance that Russia carries the double eagle in its imperial arms.

declared in 1877. The siege of Plevna, defended by Osman Pascha (1877), was the spectacular centre of the war; in it popular sympathy in England was on the side of the Turk; but the result was inevitable. Russia marched steadily south to the sea.

ENGLAND'S FOREIGN POLICY

Great Britain, under Disraeli, had always been hostile to Russia's expansion, (i) partly because of a fear for India; (ii) partly because of a desire to maintain the integrity of Turkey, the chief Mahomedan Power, with which England, as the ruler of millions of Mahomedans, could not afford to quarrel; (iii) partly because the dismemberment of Turkey might threaten the trade route through the Suez Canal, which led to the Eastern bazaars.

A congress of the Powers was therefore summoned to meet in Berlin (1878), where, according to Bismarck, the preponderating rôle in all the discussions was taken by the "old Jew" (Disraeli, now Lord Beaconsfield). Russia agreed to its decisions:

- (i) Russia to withdraw from her conquests and from Constantinople, but to have Bessarabia.
- (ii) Roumania and Servia to be sovereign States independent of Turkish suzerainty.
- (iii) Bulgaria was to be divided—(the north to be independent; the south (Eastern Roumelia) to be given home-rule under Turkish suzerainty).
- (iv) Antivari to be given to Montenegro.
- (v) Turkish integrity to be guaranteed.

Bulgaria eventually secured its unity (1885) and its independence (1896), under a Battenburg prince (1879), who became its first king (1908); it felt it owed its freedom to Russia's intervention and for long followed as a satellite in the political orbit of Russia. The union of North and South Bulgaria in 1885 made Russia angry, and thenceforward Bulgaria began to fear its annexation by Russia.

The foreign politics of England at this period were directed to peace; she did nothing to draw her into public conflict with any other European nation; her chief troubles were:

1857—The *Indian Mutiny* due to religious fanaticism, suspicion of the government's intentions to remove India from its anomalous position and annex the whole country, which was still under the East India Company. This company had begun the English adventure in India, had opened up the country to trade, and had been responsible for its peace and order. (Both Clive and Warren Hastings were the Company's servants, appointed to their position by the Company's Board at its pleasure.) Moreover, the natives were convinced that the training of the Sepoys by the English had made them equal to Europeans in fighting. The Mutiny ended in the abolition of the Company and the taking over of the dominion of India by the Crown. This Act (1st September, 1858) was completed by the Act passed by Disraeli, which created a new title for the English sovereign, and by which Queen Victoria was induced to assume the style of "Empress of India" (1877).

1886—The Home Rule Bill for Ireland introduced by Gladstone under the inspiration of Parnell, opened a new source of dispute in home politics, and almost the first opportunity for foreign interference or intrigue in English domestic administration. But England's military and naval strength at the time was considered too formidable in Europe; and the struggle of the Irish to secure their self-government had to be carried on without the intervention of foreign help. The political battle under Gladstone reached no result except (a) to make the matter a dominant one in English politics, and (b) to divide his party, so that a considerable section of it joined hands with the Conservatives (1886). This really meant that "Liberalism" henceforward became part of the political faith of both parties. The need of a distinct Liberal party, after this, was seen later to have been removed, for now the principles of "Liberalism" were, theoretically as well as practically, accepted by

everyone in politics. There was only a difference of degree, not of kind.

In 1882, after England and France had advanced loans to the Khedive of *Egypt*, the Khedive (officially the viceroy for the Turkish Sultan) declared his determination to refuse repayments; the two countries, therefore, jointly occupied the country. A Nationalist outbreak resulted: France withdrew from the difficult situation: England suppressed it by force of arms at Tel-el-Kebir in 1882. England then assumed a protectorate over the country and ruled it through a commissioner under the nominal authority of a new khedive. In 1885 the Soudan was also occupied, in order to guarantee the water supply of Egypt and to counter the religious war proclaimed against the English by the Mahdi. The death of Gordon (1885) and the loss of Khartoum were the immediate results; only after ten years (1899) was the Soudan annexed (not to Egypt but to the Empire, a distinction of some importance at a later date).

Undoubtedly, 1887, the year of Queen Victoria's Golden Jubilee, may be taken as the high mark of this period: its peace, its contentment, its European repose. But the dismissal of Bismarck, the Irish Home Rule measure, and the movement of the "nineties" were symptomatic of a new spirit. The old compromise was at last broken down; the revolution of Napoleon, continued more soberly under Victoria, which could be expressed in the narrowness and stolid sanity of the middle class, had ceased to interest people. It had ceased to be a compromise; it had become a pretence.

CHAPTER X

NEW IDEALS—THE GREAT WAR—AFTERMATH

THAT the compromise which Bonaparte inaugurated, and which the Victorian age made less adventurous but more solid, was breaking down and was dangerously becoming a mere pretence, was being steadily made evident to the Victorians themselves (in the wider European sense in which we have used the word). Both in England and all over Europe there was a steady drift away from that balancing of autocracy and the Revolution in the name of the middle class, which it had been the genius of the nineteenth century to accomplish for so long. In the so-called "naughty nineties" in France and England, to which the verse of Verlaine and Baudelaire had set the fashion, when the brilliant wit of the period was used in every direction principally to shock people and make them uncomfortable, this old balance was deliberately given up. In pictorial art in England, for instance, the efforts of Beardsley and Max Beerbohm, though partly the result of the pursuit of an austere beauty of line, were deliberately devoted to the extolling of a melancholy and exotic type which was not only unusual, but, where possible, repellent. In verse and prose there was a host of writers who formed themselves into a company with the principle of advocating experience as the test of truth, and by experience meaning little else than sin. They wrote the language of Walter Pater much more fluently than Pater had done, but, being without his learning, they could aim at little else than being fantastical, though they hoped to succeed by this at least in raising stirs and scares. Again, in the new science of political economy, the rise of the "Fabians" (under Hubert Bland and G. B. Shaw) was due to a determination to produce, not a new State so much

as a new sensation: indeed, from this period began the largest of all single literary influences on the younger generation, the wit and wisdom, the clarity and hardness of George Bernard Shaw. The dramatic quality of Shaw's plays was not so much appreciated as the brilliance of the conversation and the extreme hardihood, as it seemed, with which he expressed everyone's innermost ideas. He shocked his age by unmasking its secret thoughts to it; he was not so much original as ruthless. He unveiled the temptations that each heart kept carefully hid.

As we have stated, it was the basis of the "Victorian Compromise" that it had formulated the principle that to ignore things was to forget them and to forget them was to make them die. The Victorians believed that not to speak of things would gradually lead to not thinking of them; the new fashion maintained that to speak of anything (however nasty) prevented it from turning morbid. In the earlier age what was dreaded was "indelicacy"; in the later age, "the not being frank".

Note, in passing, 1901 as an *annus mirabilis*; the first wireless message was sent across the Atlantic, the first British submarine was constructed, the first dirigible balloon was steered by Santos Dumont round the Eiffel tower.

A. THE BALKANS

In foreign politics, however, there were at first no obvious signs of war, but the main disturbing feature was now to lie in the Near East. The Balkan States, which had never troubled Europe so long as they were alternately governed and massacred by Turkey, began, as soon as they were independent, to cause considerable agitation between themselves and between their bigger neighbours. The chief centre of trouble at first was Bulgaria, where Alexander of Battenberg had been elected Prince in 1879; in 1885, Eastern Roumelia (at first a separate province under Turkish rule) and Bulgaria became united. This, since it meant a stronger Bulgaria, caused much anxiety in Russia. At once, before this union had had time to harden into reality, Servia fell on Bulgaria; it was defeated at Slivnitsa (November, 1885). Turkey promptly made peace with Bulgaria, seeing in this

alliance a weapon against both Russia and Servia, and therefore a very practical defence against them. Russia was supported in her opposition to this new Bulgaria by Germany; Great Britain, however, supported Prince Alexander in his new kingdom, partly because in effect, though not in theory (for it was a further dismemberment of Turkey), this fitted in with her pro-Turkish and anti-Russian policy, partly because the Battenbergs were related to the English royal house. Russia, however, persisted in her opposition to the Bulgarian development, and in August, under Russian instigation, Prince Alexander was seized and carried off; under duress (in September) he abdicated and a regency was appointed under Stambulov, who, as prime minister, was the strongest force in Bulgaria against the revolution which Russia was provoking. By the direction of Stambulov Prince Alexander was re-established, but again abdicated before the year was out. The next year Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg (whose wife was a Bourbon), was chosen to succeed to Prince Alexander; he accepted the throne, and the excitement died down.

But Bismarck, who had already hoped to include Russia in it when he founded the Triple Alliance, now made a second offer to Russia; this time to support her against Austria, if Austria attacked her. This was in November 1887, at a secret meeting he had with the Tsar. Yet within three months he had again publicly insisted on the value of the Triple Alliance and actually published a secret treaty already made with Austria in 1879 at Gastein, in which each had agreed to support the other if it were attacked. Despite that, and despite the Triple Alliance of 1883, Germany repeatedly made secret overtures to Russia against Austria, and then publicly re-stated the reasons why the Triple Alliance gave peace to Europe and strengthened each of the three Powers involved.

In 1890, Bismarck was dismissed, and in 1891 Von Moltke died (he was the German general to whom above others were due the victories of the Franco-Prussian war); owing to these deaths, before the century ended public opinion in Europe had begun to think of the empire as now a new Germany at last, set free from the incubus of the war-like inheritance of Prussia's military

tyranny (Prussia whose "only industry," said Rousseau, "was war").

Bulgaria being now quieted, Serbia was the next Balkan State to occasion disputes; in 1889 the heir to the Austrian Empire, Rudolph, shot himself; his cousin, the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, therefore became heir presumptive to the Emperor. By a curious fatality, which later events were to recall, troubles began in Serbia that very year. These troubles were fated to cast larger shadows, when at Sarajevo, in 1914, the same Archduke Francis Ferdinand was bombed to death, no doubt under the revolutionary violence of Servian conspirators.

In 1894 Nicholas II succeeded to the Tsardom of Russia; Stambulov was assassinated in 1895; and the two sovereigns, Nicholas and Ferdinand, left to their own devices, came closer together; Stambulov had been looked on by Russia all the time as the instigator of the policy of a larger and stronger Bulgaria. In 1896 the Bulgarian trouble ended in the recognition of Ferdinand by all the powers as prince of the whole territory of the union.

No sooner was this settled than a quarrel over the Cretan question again provoked the opposition of Russia to Turkey. A rising in Crete against Turkey took place in 1890; the Greek government sent a flotilla to help the insurgents, and then declared war on Turkey, which invaded Thessaly (with Epirus, given to Greece by Turkey in 1881 on the initiative of Great Britain) and defeated the army of Greece. So severe was her defeat that Greece had to submit to terms of peace forced on her by the Turks in December of 1897, by which the frontiers of the two states were now settled more favourably to the Turks. But eventually the Powers stepped in, and refused to accept the treaty as it stood, imposing Prince George of Greece on Turkey as the High Commissioner of Crete which was, however, still left under Turkish sovereignty. Affairs then moved slowly; not until 1902 did England, France, Russia and Italy present a joint note to Turkey insisting on the need of reforms in Crete; that same year a joint note of all the Powers was also presented to Turkey, declaring the need of reforms in Macedonia as well. Already

earlier than this, in 1897, Russia and Austria had decided to control Macedonia themselves; this had roused the opposition of Italy, which looked with distrust on any attempt to settle questions on the Greek hinterland without her being consulted. But when Albania broke free from Turkish sovereignty and set up for itself (1903), the two imperial Powers agreed to delimit their spheres of interest by dividing Albania and Macedonia between themselves, each taking a separate district for its protection. This still further angered Italy, for Albania was nearer to her than Macedonia, lying along the Adriatic coast and offering several convenient bays which could easily be made into strongly-fortified naval bases and which would threaten her eastern harbours and Brindisi.

By this time, Germany had become the dominant Power in Turkish politics; this influence had begun in 1883, when German officers were sent to drill the Turkish soldiers, and it was strengthened in 1889, when William II paid a visit to Constantinople. By 1899 German diplomacy had ousted the British from their predominance in the counsels of Turkey. Consequently, for the next dozen years it was Germany which took over the task of opposing the development of strong Balkan nationalities which might threaten the Turkish integrity and, incidentally, the Bagdad railway, which, from now on, became the supreme Eastern effort of German foreign policy. Germany, therefore, in her new rôle of friend to Turkey, refused to take interest in the Cretan demonstration, and only accepted a part in the Macedonian note to Turkey because her ally Austria was implicated in it; otherwise she refused to join in any collective remonstrance to the Sultan against his violent repression of reform. Curiously, however, the Young Turk Movement had German support, presumably because it seemed likely (1900) to bring in a definite party pledged to a Western régime and susceptible to Western influence and, therefore, not so impervious to Western blandishments as the old Turk sometimes showed himself. Incidentally, the "young Turk" was not unfrequently a German Jew.

Besides the Balkans, there were three other centres of trouble. The reason for this trouble was in all cases the same. It con-

cerned the development of new colonies and markets, for Europe could now offer no further room for expansion to any State. Frontiers were little likely ever again to be much altered. Consequently the Powers (and especially the newer Powers) had to look to other continents for new fields of activity, that is for trade and commerce. To any nation thus casting its eyes abroad, there appeared first, Africa (North and South, East and West), secondly, China. But in China, Japan had always the advantage over the other Powers, because (i) of her nearer geographical proximity, (ii) of racial and linguistic approximation, and (iii) latterly of having become Westernised with such a modification of the Western ideals as seemed likely to be more acceptable to the Chinese mentality.

B. AFRICA

Hitherto, for the last centuries, England alone had been the great coloniser. But in 1890 the German government formed a new colonial department, and began (by arrangement with Great Britain) to colonise East Africa, and signed a convention to that end with Great Britain in July, 1890, limiting the various spheres of influence of the two countries. In 1895 the German Emperor further announced that at last it had become opportune for Germany and the Transvaal to be more closely united. Already in 1884, Kruger had visited Germany as well as England and had made a treaty with the old Emperor, William I. The same year in which William II made this new declaration, a conference of Powers had taken place in Berlin to discuss African problems. Amongst other resolutions, it was there decided to suppress the slave trade in the Congo, to extend the sovereignty of Portugal and France in each direction in the Congo territory, and to uphold the free navigation of the great rivers in the interests of open international trade. When, therefore, after this declaration of the Emperor in 1895 (that the Transvaal should look on Germany as its especial friend), President Kruger closed the Vaal River Drifts (October 1st) to foreigners, the English government chose to look upon this act as directly hostile to itself, for the district of the Vaal River Drifts had suddenly become of

great value to the gold-seeker, and had been the new hope of the speculators. Already, ten years before (1886), the Rand gold-fields had been "proclaimed" by the Transvaal government, and with their opening the great rush had begun. Johannesburg was founded that year by Johannes Russik (died 1926). But meanwhile there had been trouble between the Republic and the British.

Not long before, in the February of 1884, a Transvaal convention had been signed in London by the British and Boers, in virtue of which (confirming the Convention of Pretoria in 1881):

(i) The name of the Transvaal State had been changed to the South African Republic.

(ii) The boundaries of the States had been definitely determined.

(iii) The foreign relations of the Republic had been recognised by both sides to be part of the "interests of Great Britain" and to be subject, therefore, to British control.

(iv) The independence of Swaziland had been proclaimed (the natives were always hostile to the Boers).

(v) Basutoland was also annexed to British territory in March and South Lucia Bay (Zululand) in November.

(vi) All settlers were to be exempted from commandeering.*

In 1885 the Boers, who had begun to encroach on Bechuana-land, already occupied by the British, were summarily expelled. In 1888 (October) the British Chartered Company had been founded to administer the mining concession made by Lobengula; in 1889 the British South Africa Company had received its charter; in 1890 Mashonaland was exploited by a band of pioneers and Salisbury founded there, named after the actual prime minister of England. A whole group of British territories in South Africa had now therefore been consolidated. When, therefore, the Boers trekked across the Limpopo 1891, they were met by the British and driven back by the Chartered Company's police. The very same year the Company had another sharp encounter, this time with the Portuguese, to the East. This

*To "commandeer" means to be compelled to join the local military force or *commando* at the call of its chief.

Portuguese raid had been successfully beaten off and satisfactorily ended by a treaty with Portugal in July 1891. In 1893 the Matabele war had given Bulawayo to the British; out of this territory, therefore, newly acquired or newly organised, namely, Mashonaland and Matabeleland (now called Rhodesia after the master of these enterprises, Cecil Rhodes), Great Britain had built up a territory which hemmed in the South African Republic on the north; it already held its eastern and the southern borders.

In 1894, just before the Kaiser had publicly declared that friendly relations existed between Germany and the Transvaal, British subjects had protested to the Republic that they were being commandeered in the Transvaal in contravention of the Treaty of London in 1884. A year later, in 1895, the third Salisbury administration took office in England, and *Joseph Chamberlain* became Colonial Secretary. He had already made a name for himself, not only in politics (first a Radical, then a Liberal, then a Unionist), but in industry. To him, therefore, the British Empire was naturally familiar, not merely as a political unity, but as a trading unity. He saw it in terms of commerce as well as power. In him was personified the new spirit in imperial politics; indeed, in international politics: not power for itself, but as a means through commerce to new wealth.

It happened, therefore, that when the Vaal River Drifts were closed in that year (1st October, 1895), the man in charge of the department of the British government which had to deal with the situation was more than usually likely to make a vigorous retort. The Drifts were accordingly re-opened on November 5th; but on December 30th to complete the humiliation of the Transvaal, *Dr. Jameson* started his raid into its territory to secure by force what peaceful means had been unable wholly to win. The raiding party was defeated and taken prisoner on January 1st, 1896. After its failure was evident (6th January, 1896), Cecil Rhodes, who had at least known of the raid if he had not organised it, resigned his premiership of Cape Colony. In between these two events, on January 3rd, the Kaiser, in pursuance of his policy, of expanding German colonial possessions in Africa, sent a telegram to the President to congratulate him on the suppression of

the Raid. Inevitably the feeling between England, where Chamberlain was Colonial Secretary, and Germany was much embittered by this telegram; so much so that, not only was a British naval force ordered to Delagoa Bay (January 7th), but a flying squadron of ships was organised for the North Sea (January 8th). In 1897, Alfred Milner was appointed High Commissioner in the Cape, and the dealings of the British government with Kruger were not made any more pacific by his way of handling the situation. Meanwhile, though the British South Africa Company officially condemned the Raid and blamed Cecil Rhodes for his share in it, the harm done by this unwarrantable aggressive act and the implication in it of the prime minister of the neighbouring British colony, naturally damaged the British position in the international world.

The Boer War

Meanwhile, a series of events followed to excite even greater bitterness still between the two States. A British subject was murdered in Transvaal territory, and the crime went unpunished (1898); the attempted annexation of Swaziland by the Boers provoked meetings of the British in the Transvaal which were suppressed by authority; the Transvaal government, which now sought to free itself from its British connection by establishing its position as a sovereign state, in this found itself opposed strongly by Chamberlain in the name of the old treaty of 1884. The Transvaal president, therefore, called a conference with the president of the Orange River republic in the capital of that State, Bloemfontein, in June, 1899. In the interests of peace or at least of preventing external interference in the coming war, Cecil Rhodes had visited the Kaiser four months earlier to discuss with him the general relations of the two home countries. This had no effect on the South African crisis. On October 9th, the two presidents issued their ultimatum to Great Britain, demanding that their political independence should be recognised. In reply, war was declared by England on the republics, and the battles of Talana Hill (October 20th) and Elandslaagte (October 21st) were fought in the same month.

But the Boers, though comparatively few in numbers, were fighting the kind of war to which they were well accustomed, and which of its nature needed no very large forces. They fought it their own way. On the other hand, the British had rested for so long upon their military prestige achieved at Waterloo and confirmed in the Crimea, that they had insufficient forces for a campaign like this. Their army was, perhaps, adequate in numbers to defend the boundaries of the empire: it was wholly inadequate to force a successful decision on the people who were opposing them over a wide country known perfectly to them but unknown to the military chiefs of England. Moreover, the British armies were badly led, for the strategy and tactics of the British commanders were both badly conceived and ill-executed. Only after three British reverses, between December 10th and 15th, did the home government realise that some other way of fighting was necessary if the British were to achieve their purpose and subdue the Boers. Lord Roberts, who had shown energy and quickness of decision in India and Afghanistan, was therefore now appointed commander-in-chief in South Africa with Herbert Kitchener (who had in the September of the previous year overwhelmed the levies of the Mahdi at Atbara and Omdurman, and had occupied Khartoum) as his chief-of-staff. The dominions of Canada, Australia and New Zealand sent mounted troops to reinforce the English regular armies, and Lord Lovat in Scotland raised the Lovat Scouts from his districts somewhat similar to the Transvaal in geography. All these new troops were men accustomed to tracking game on the hillsides; accustomed, therefore, to the art of taking cover and of following and stalking, who could shoot easily and did not need to be led by direction or formation. This better adapted material under the scientific handling of Lord Roberts (landed at Cape Town January 16th) soon made all the difference to the progress of the war; Bloemfontein was occupied (March 13th) and Pretoria (June 5th). Having thus established the British in command of the military situation, Lord Roberts went home. Kitchener now took charge, adopted the system of making concentration-camps into which to put the women and non-combatants, and of building block-houses

at intervals along lines which gradually closed in on the mobile commandos of the Boers, and then organised drives to sweep the Boers in numbers within these rigid nets. The system proved successful. The war was ended on 31st May, 1902, by the peace of Vereeniging; in November 1902 Chamberlain visited South Africa; in 1904 Milner ceased to be High Commissioner; in 1907 the two republics, which by the peace had become British territory, were now made into provinces of a unified *dominion of South Africa* and granted full dominion status along with Cape Colony and Natal.

All this while fear had existed in England lest Germany should take advantage of the situation and interfere; France had even threatened to use force to secure the independence of the republics, in satisfaction for the action of Kitchener after the battle of Omdurman, who had found a French force at Fashoda on the Nile in territory which was claimed by the British, and had made it retire by the sheer insistence of superior force which could not be gainsaid. Of the two countries, however, Germany was the one which probably had more seriously considered the advisability of interfering, but the declaration of Chamberlain in January 1902 that England would regard all attempts at mediation as hostile acts, and the knowledge that this would mean the employment against her of the naval strength of England, prevented Germany from taking action. Her Navy Bill had only been introduced to her parliament in February, 1900, and had been passed in June of that year: she had not received any of its ships. Hence, although the Kaiser had publicly proclaimed the friendship of Germany for the Transvaal in 1895, he had now to stand impotently by and watch that republic being crushed. But he did this with good grace. On 22nd January, 1901, the funeral of Queen Victoria took place, and the Kaiser attended it; his presence was cheered by the London crowd.

But the Boer War produced many effects:

(i) It may have caused the death of Queen Victoria, who felt that the glamour of her reign was being dimmed by this public demonstration of the military inefficiency of the British arms.

(ii) It resulted in the re-organisation of the British army and

of its equipment; khaki was introduced, more attention given to marksmanship, especially more individuality allowed to the officers in command of companies of regiments. The pressure of too much mechanical and inhuman discipline was relaxed.

(iii) The Kaiser realised even more the importance of a strong navy, and his own convictions were now shared by his ministers and even by his people, for the anti-British feeling of the public in Germany would probably have led to intervention by force during the South African War, had her navy been strong enough to hold its own against a British naval attack.

C. CHINA

After Africa, the next centre of disturbance was another country where trade had begun to assume dimensions sufficiently important to warrant eagerness on the part of European nations to take a share in it. Like Turkey, China was looked on as "a sick empire," that was getting near its end. On September 30th, 1896, the first move was made by Russia in a convention signed by her and China; being her next door neighbour, Russia naturally was the first to take action. It needed little acumen to see in the north of China, above Pekin, near her own Siberian territory, a tract of land (Manchuria) which needed "development" for the purposes of trade. The convention provided:

(i) That Russia should construct a railway across Manchuria to Vladivostock, and then to Mukden.

(ii) Russia was to enjoy mining rights in Manchuria.

(iii) Kiao-Chau was to be leased to Russia for fifteen years.

At once began a *scramble for territory* in China by the other Powers:

1897-November 17th. German troops landed at Kiao-Chau.
December 16th. Prince Henry, the Kaiser's brother, in command of a squadron of German ships, left Kiel to support the troops.

December 18th. Russian warships entered Port Arthur.

1898-January. British warships left Port Arthur.

March 5th. Germany succeeded in securing for herself the lease of Kiao-Chau.

March 27. Russia secured the lease of Port Arthur for twenty-five years.

April. England secured the lease of Wei-hai-Wei. [She did this under advice, in order to hold a check on Russia and Germany. For the same reason France secured the lease of Kwang-chan-Wan.

In 1900 the Chinese *Boxer rising* took place, due to the fear amongst the Chinese population of their complete annexation, caused by these successive occupations of Chinese territory by the Great Powers for the sake of trade. The Chinese not unnaturally supposed that this was to be the first step in a partition of the country amongst the Western nations, and considered that only a declaration of war could save them from becoming the prey of commercial Powers which were interested, not in the well-being of China, but in the wealth to be got out of it. Indeed, there can be little doubt that the Western Powers were moved chiefly by what they hoped to get out of China. This was perhaps the lowest point (because most selfish) reached by common European foreign policy, for at once it developed into a scramble to seize, under the pretence of purchase, the best ports of China in the name of its development and for the sake of trade. Russia replied by drowning 4,500 Chinese in Manchuria, an international fleet led by England demonstrated off the coast, and an international army led by Germany marched up from the coast to Peking. The result of this combined naval and military expedition was the extortion of a payment of an indemnity by China for the harm done in the Boxer rising, and the cession of the ports to the respective Powers that already owned them.

THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR

Four years later some of the results of this selfishness on the part of the Great Powers to China became evident. Its two neighbouring Powers, Russia and Japan, fought over their Chinese spoils, in particular over the dominant position in Manchuria, where Russia had gradually pushed her influence beyond her treaty rights and was absorbing into her Siberian territory this rich Chinese province. Japan had long since cast

her own eyes on it, partly pressed on by the rapid multiplication of her population, which was increasing beyond the capacity of the country to support, and partly infected by the Western greed for trade. Moreover, Japan had for so long, under European influence, been gradually Westernising herself, that she now considered herself a match in arms for the Russian forces. Her army had been trained on German methods and her navy on British. As soon as war was begun she quickly established over the enemy, as she had foreseen, her supremacy on land and sea. In April 1904 the victory of the Yalu River was the opening of her succession of victories; in 1905 the Russians, besieged in Port Arthur, surrendered to the Japanese, and later in the same year suffered so heavy a defeat in the long-drawn battle of Mukden that Manchuria itself was completely cleared of Russian troops. But the crowning victory of the Japanese took place in the naval battle of Tsu-Shima (27th-29th May, 1905), when the Russian fleet was destroyed. Through American influence the two Powers were persuaded to submit to arbitration, and peace was made at Portsmouth, U.S.A., September 1905. The part played by the United States in the peace negotiations was favourably received by Russia; ill-received by Japan. Had Japan felt herself a match for the armed forces of the United States also, she would have fought the war on to the end. But she was too exhausted by her efforts to do anything but accept the terms dictated to her by President Roosevelt, who had become alarmed at the success of Japan and who feared the proximity to the United States of so progressive and so prolific a race in a mood of victory. Japan reluctantly surrendered to the inevitable; she agreed to give Russia easier terms than she would of herself have demanded, and to forego the fruits of her victory—only because she could not well help herself. But through her victory over Russia the prestige of the West in Asiatic eyes was lost for ever. White troops were no longer invincible to the races of the East. Their supremacy was shown to have been due to no more than material advantages, better weapons, better discipline, and a more scientific defence. With the possession of the same material advantages the Asiatic now judged that he could equal or defeat any white race.

Henceforth two tendencies become apparent in the Eastern peoples.

(i) One party urging their immediate Westernisation in order not to become the prey of the white races.

(ii) Another party urging that they could have nothing to gain by Westernisation, except a merely material and physical advantage, and that these material gains would only result in the loss of their individuality—of their "soul."

D. MOROCCO

The fourth geographical centre of dispute between European nations at the opening of the new century lay round Morocco, on the North African shore. France in Algiers and Spain in Morocco had both been organising the resources of their colonies just across the Mediterranean. Italy had endeavoured both in Tripoli and through her Abyssinian war also to expand, but with less success, for the defeat of the Italians at Adawa (1896) by the Abyssinians had ended their progress in that direction. England, too, had her share in this adventure, for she had taken over the administration of Egypt, though under an agreement with France (which foresaw trouble there) she had not annexed it. She had not annexed it partly because of this agreement, and partly because of her traditional tenderness to the Turkish empire and her fear that, were any part of that empire to be annexed by a Western nation, the scramble for her dismemberment would lead to a general war.

A late comer, the German empire, which elsewhere had fished successfully in troubled waters, saw itself forestalled in, and crowded out of, these North African adventures; but under the pressure of its growing population, and because of its confidence in its scientific development of industry, it was now determined to secure, in the phrase of the Kaiser, "a place in the sun." In 1904 France made an agreement with England and with Spain, by which the allocation between herself and Spain of their respective spheres of interest was definitely agreed upon. The Sultan accepted the principle of this division in 1905. Then Germany (in March, 1905), through the imperial chancellor, declared that

it would not countenance the exclusive policy of France in Morocco which this convention recognised, but that it demanded an "open door" of trade for all. In April, to produce a greater effect, the Kaiser visited Tangiers in person. No doubt, in consequence of this public division amongst his European enemies, the Sultan rejected the French proposals, which in principle he had already approved. This time the French foreign minister, Delcassé, resigned, in order to lessen the tension with Germany, which her public action against France had occasioned. Under its pressure the French government climbed down in September and came to terms with Germany; and in 1906 a European conference was called at *Algeciras*, at which the German demands were in large measure accepted. There followed, however, much bitterness in France over this public surrender to the threat of war implied in Germany's action; but the military and political weakness of the country was so apparent that it was clear nothing else could have been done.

FRANCO-GERMAN RELATIONS

This weakness was due to:

(i) This very Morocco dispute which was now only temporarily settled, and which left opportunities for further menaces by Germany. It was evidently only the beginning of a quarrel, perhaps of successive humiliations.

(ii) A religious quarrel, which had increased between the French Government and the Vatican; Pius X broke off relations with the republic, refused to continue the concordat and, therefore, proceeded to appoint and depose bishops, irrespective of the government, claiming that the government had already violated the concordat by suppressing religious education and religious orders, and finally by dispossessing the Catholics of their churches.

(iii) A dispute in the South of France (almost amounting to a rebellion) over the high cost of living, due to the failure of the government to provide markets for the light wines of the south.

(iv) Labour troubles occasioned partly by the economic

difficulties of the country and partly by the increase of the Socialist philosophy.

Meanwhile, at the moment when the relations between France and Germany were most strained, the German government made two public declarations of her policy which were to be remembered long after.

(i) In 1907 at the second Hague Conference, she refused to discuss the proposal for the limitation of armaments which had been submitted to the conference. (This had been founded by the Tsar in order to establish a central tribunal for peace.)

(ii) Yet at that conference she, along with the other Powers present, signed various articles, on October 18th, amongst which were the following:

(a) The territory of a neutral Power is inviolable.

(b) Belligerents are forbidden to move troops, or convoys of munitions of war, or supplies, across the territory of a neutral Power.

(c) A neutral Power in repelling, even by force, attacks on its neutrality, cannot be regarded as guilty of a hostile act.

In 1908 there was a temporary sensation in European politics and the menace of war by the action of Austria in annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina (Turkish provinces which she had undertaken to protect). Russia was inclined to oppose by force this intrusion of Austria into Slav or Croat territory; but Germany publicly declared her approval of Austria, and Russia was obliged to agree. Eventually, the Austrian action was ratified by the Powers of Europe in 1909.

To the consternation of France, in 1910 the Tsar, France's only ally, went to visit the Kaiser; and after the meeting it was publicly announced that certain agreements had been reached between the two emperors concerning the German plans for building railways to remain under her protection in the eastern part of the Turkish empire, namely, towards Arabia and the Persian Gulf. The reasons why this caused consternation in France were:

(i) Because the visit of the Tsar was felt to have endangered the closeness of the alliance between France and Russia.

(N.B. It was the policy of France always to ally herself with the country that lay on the further frontier of the neighbour she feared, so as to secure a diversion in her favour in time of war; an invasion on the further frontier of her enemy neighbour would save her from having to meet alone the whole army of her enemy. Earlier she had been in alliance with Poland and Sweden; now it was with Russia; later it was to be with Poland again.)

(ii) Because the projected Eastern railways were looked upon by England as a threat to her sphere of influence and, therefore, the approval of them by the Tsar alienated England from Russia, and was a menace to that triple alliance of France, Russia and England, which French statesmen looked upon as the only makeweight in European politics to the other triple alliance of Germany, Austria and Italy. But as the Liberal government in England, like the Conservative government before it, absolutely refused to make definite European alliances, it was not known whether England did regard herself as the friend of these two strangely consorted allies.

In 1911 the menace of war grew even more threatening; again it was caused by the same North-African dispute. The French had occupied Fez, the capital of Morocco, in order to impose peace in that Sultanate by force of arms. At the time the government of France was in the hands of M. Caillaux, whose financial skill was successfully solving the dislocated economic problems of the country. Immediately, in order to show disapproval of this French advance in Morocco and to secure for herself a port on that Atlantic seaboard of the coast of Morocco, Germany despatched a gunboat, the *Panther*, to Agadir, with the intention of annexing that port.

Again, as in the Chinese situation, none of the nations concerned seem to have troubled themselves to enquire what were the desires of the country which they were occupying. It was obviously another scramble for territory that seemed likely, through anarchy, to become derelict. Still, France and Spain had been already for many years between them engaged in the task of administering the country, and had at least the show of a prescrip-

tive right to be where they were. To the common mind of Europe this action of Germany therefore appeared to be cynically aggressive, a threat to France without any semblance of justification—at best the ill-humour of a robber who has arrived later on the scene than his fellow robbers. The public opinion of both countries was inflamed, and war seemed imminent. But the declaration of the English prime minister that “His Majesty’s government was also interested” in Morocco and would not allow the French administration to be hampered or restrained, forced the German government, which was not prepared to meet a general European war, to repudiate the extremist element in the country and to withdraw its ships from Agadir. By the treaty with Germany, which “closed the incident,” (Berlin, 1911, November 4th), France had, however, in return for being left a free hand in Morocco, to surrender a large part of her territory in the Congo to Germany.

That year, 1911, saw:

(i) The coronation of George V and his Queen in Westminster Abbey.

(ii) The marriage of Archduke Charles (the nephew of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, who was heir to the Austrian throne), to Princess Zita of Bourbon Parma.

(iii) The introduction of the Parliament Act into the House of Commons in England, whereby the veto of the House of Lord on all legislation which had three times been passed by the House of Commons was removed.

(iv) The Coronation Durbar of George V as Emperor of India at Delhi.

THE BALKANS

In 1912 a Balkan League was formed of Bulgaria, Servia, Greece and Montenegro, the purpose of which was to make a joint attack on Turkey. As already Turkey was at war with Italy, it was with high hopes that the Balkan States invaded Turkey. The invasion was eminently successful, and the four armies would undoubtedly have captured Constantinople, had not the Great Powers intervened. Under their compulsion,

peace was signed on 30th May, 1913, with the cession of certain territory to Bulgaria (including Adrianople, held by the Turks since 1422), and to Serbia; Albania was made autonomous, and Crete was given to Greece (where its prime minister, Venizelos, had revised the constitution so as to give the country a modern constitutional government). The Great Powers had no desire to see the collapse of Turkey benefit anyone else but themselves. The effect of the war was, however, not merely to weaken Turkey, but also to discourage German ambitions through Turkey, and to alarm Austria, which saw in the enlargement of Serbia a threat to her own predominance in the Balkans. Moreover, it now seemed likely that a Slav population would in any need turn more naturally to Russia than to her.

Only a month later (June, 1913), the second Balkan War broke out, Bulgaria attacking Serbia and Greece, refusing Russian intervention, and endeavouring to destroy by force the Servian leadership of the Balkan Slavs. Already Germany and Austria had proposed to Italy to limit the pretensions of Serbia. Italy had refused. Austria herself now threatened to interfere directly and alone, since Serbia had invaded Albanian territory. Under this threat Serbia withdrew her troops from Albania. Meanwhile, Bulgaria was in turn attacked by Roumania, which had not fought against Turkey, and was fresh and well organised. It had watched the first Balkan War without breaking its neutrality; it now invaded Bulgaria, as also with immediate effect did Turkey. Adrianople was recovered by the Turks (July 22nd), and when peace was forced on Bulgaria and signed on 6th August, 1913, Roumania naturally had also acquired territory at Bulgaria's expense.

When the year ended, Bulgaria was nearly crushed; but while Turkey was still weak, Serbia had increased her possessions, as also had Greece and Roumania. In effect, therefore, the Balkan States that were friendly to Russia had gained; only the friend of Austria had lost, for Bulgaria had once more left Russia for Austria. On 5th October, 1908, Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria had assumed the title of Tsar; he had been received with royal honours by the Emperor of Austria that year; he had again

changed the religion of his son Boris from the Orthodox Church under the earlier inspiration of Russia to the Catholic Church under the inspiration of Austria, and was again to change it back to Orthodoxy now. The boy was confirmed a Catholic, which was the religion of his parents; he had been baptised in the Orthodox faith, which was the religion of the Russian Tsar.

In 1912 the threat on the part of Austria to prevent the development of Servia and Roumania had already antagonised Russia, which, therefore, afraid of what later happened, passed an Army Bill in 1913 to increase the number of its conscripts. In 1912 Poincaré became prime minister of France, and with him again came into office as foreign minister, Delcassé, who had been compelled to resign in 1905, being sacrificed to propitiate Germany. That he was now installed again in the same post showed that France was no longer afraid of her rival. In 1913 Poincaré became president and (to keep pace with the other growing armies) a French Army Bill was passed, which, amongst other provisions, increased the length of time for a conscript's service from two years to three. Germany realised now that the long talked of war was growing near.

In 1914, on June 17th, the Hohenzollern Canal from Berlin to the Oder was opened; on June 23rd the Kiel Canal, after enlargement, was re-opened; in June, too, German firms in Russia were ordered to send home gold.

ENGLAND'S DIFFICULTIES

In England the years following the coronation of King George V (1911) had been years of *domestic strife*. The Liberal political victory of 1906 had not affected the Conservative strength in the non-elective House of Lords; and several important Liberal measures which had been approved by large majorities in the Commons were thrown out by the Lords, including the Budget of 1909, which had been framed by Lloyd George. The Liberals, therefore, dissolved Parliament and appealed to the country. In the General Election which followed the Liberals lost many seats, and the political grouping of the parties made them depend for a

majority on the votes of other parties. The composition of the new House of Commons was as follows:

Liberals	-	-	-	-	-	272
Conservatives	-	-	-	-	-	271
Irish Nationalists	-	-	-	-	-	76
Independent Nationalists	-	-	-	-	-	8
Labour	-	-	-	-	-	46

But the Liberals now introduced an Act (called the Parliament Bill) which gave to the House of Commons the power to present a Bill directly to the King for his approval (in spite of its rejection by the House of Lords), if thrice passed by the Commons and thrice thrown out by the Lords.

In 1911 this Parliament Bill was read for a third time, accepted by the House of Lords and approved by the King. A Home Rule Bill was introduced into the House of Commons in 1912, defeated later in the year, but again passed before the year's end. Feeling was aroused both in Ireland and England; partly because of the political embitterment that had resulted from the practical suppression of the power of the House of Lords, and partly because of the racial antagonism of Ulster to the new Home Rule Bill, which would have placed it under Dublin in a unified Parliament. While Ulster armed herself for what seemed now an inevitable combat, the Nationalists in Ireland determined also to arm themselves, and against the wish of their leader, John Redmond, began to raise and drill an army of their own. Meanwhile, parallel with the constitutional and Irish disputes, from 1908 onwards the suffrage movement (i.e., in favour of giving votes to women) prosecuted a violent campaign to achieve its end by force, since persuasion had no effect on Parliament. This campaign reached its height during 1913 and 1914.

Moreover, from now on, the political fever grew still more in intensity through the rejection by the House of Lords of the Welsh Disestablishment Bill, the Irish Home Rule Bill, and the Anti-Plural Voting Bill, in July 1913. Of these three the Irish problem was the most fiercely contested, and the action of the secretary for

war in asking the officers of the British regiments in Ireland whether they would march to coerce Ulster in the event of civil war, produced so much severe criticism that the prime minister, Asquith, had to remove his colleague and take over that office himself. The Ulster leaders had, meanwhile, been obtaining ammunition from Germany and had visited the Kaiser, who was thus cognisant of the threat of civil war in Ireland. At the same time he was also aware that the campaign of the suffragists was dislocating the public life of England, and that by it the most solemn events were being disturbed by their action—country houses burnt, monuments destroyed, and the Derby race marred by a woman throwing herself before the King's horse and suffering fatal injuries, in consequence from which she died. The retort of the government to this was to imprison the women, which was answered by their refusal, when in prison, to take food. The result of this was that the government at first instituted "forcible feeding" on a large scale, but with great loss of prestige, for public opinion was outraged at this necessarily brutal treatment. Yet it seemed that the only alternative was for the government to surrender to violence, which would destroy the constitutional order of public life and of politics. Thus, a deadlock was reached, and no one could propose a way out that was likely to be acceptable to the government and the suffragists. Thus, both in England and Ireland, public life in the summer of 1914 was paralysed.

THE GREAT WAR

On March 31st (letter of General Waldersee of Germany) in Germany "all the work connected with mobilisation had been completed according to schedule, the army was ready." On June 28th at Serajevo, the capital of Bosnia (Austrian territory since 1908), the heir to the Austrian throne (the Archduke Francis Ferdinand) and his wife were assassinated by bombs thrown at them by Servian conspirators. On July 24th Austria sent an ultimatum to Servia, which Servia as a whole accepted, but yet in the reservations that she made apparently gave Austria the impression that her acceptance was not sincere,



THE WESTERN FRONT

On July 27th the British fleet was sent to its war stations.

On July 28th Austria declared war on Servia.

On July 29th Russia mobilised against Austria on her south-western frontier, and simultaneously Germany refused the European conference proposed by Sir E. Grey.

On July 31st Russia mobilised against Germany on her north-western frontier. But simultaneously Austria consented to reopen the discussion with Servia.

Count Lerchenfeld telegraphed to Munich: "Prussian General Staff contemplates war against France with great confidence and counts upon being able to overthrow France in four weeks; in French army no good spirit, few howitzers and inferior rifles."

On August 1st Germany mobilised.

On August 2nd Germany invaded Luxembourg.

On August 3rd Germany sent ultimatum to Belgium, announcing her determination to pass through its territory, and Germany also declared war on France.

On August 4th Germany invaded Belgium; England issued an ultimatum to Germany to evacuate Belgium before midnight.

At midnight, since Germany had not evacuated Belgium nor begun to do so, England declared war.

The war, which dated for England from August 4th, from August 3rd for France and Belgium, gradually drew into its toils almost every nation in Europe, Asia, Africa, America and Australia, though each came into it for reasons of its own; it became, in fact, a world-war. Its chief theatres were (i) the line of trenches from the Belgian coast to the south of France, (ii) the Russian frontier, (iii) the Alpine boundary between Italy and Austria (when Italy joined the Allied forces in May, 1915), (iv) the German colonies, (v) the Turkish empire, and (vi) the sea. There were other expeditions—chiefly Salonika, the Dardanelles and Palestine—which took off a number of troops and involved other national units: but the great centres were to be the decisive centres. Naturally it was not long before the German colonies had almost all fallen off from the mother country, since from the day when the British fleet went to its war stations it was impossible for Germany even to contest the control of the seas, and without that control she was unable to help her colonies. So that it became a mere matter of time as to when they were to be reduced. Of them all, the colonies in East Africa alone made a continued stand.

The Russian frontier (in spite of the French dependence on Russia as the pivot of her foreign policy) afforded very little relief to the allied front, because the Russian troops were ill-armed and had few munitions. At first successful, and then heavily defeated, the Russian troops in 1916 began at last, under Brusiloff, to show their capacity by defeating the enemy and capturing them in droves. Under the influence of this success Roumania threw in her lot with Russia, only to be immediately invaded and destroyed by German-led Austrian forces. The reason for this was that in

the meanwhile the Russian advance had faltered, since the munitions had given out and the wretched troops, ill-fed and ill-clothed, had no weapons for fighting. Behind the troops suddenly loomed the shadow of the Revolution, that began by the abdication of the Tsar at a railway siding at Pskov, on March 15th of 1917, forced on him by the army. The moderate revolutionary republic of Kerensky was soon followed by the Bolshevist Soviet government established by Lenin and Trotsky, who were sent from Germany into Russia to bring about the elimination of Russia from the fighting line. Weaponless against their external enemies, the new government at once embarked on a policy of terror and exterminated all its opponents within its territories, destroying the imperial family at Ekaterinburg and massacring the leaders of the aristocracy and middle classes, and finally establishing a despotism of city workers with the connivance of the peasantry, which had recovered its lands from the great landlords, and which cared little at first what was happening elsewhere. The formal elimination of Russia from the war was accomplished by the Brest-Litovsk treaty, signed by Germany and the Soviet leaders in December of that year (1917). Its effect was at once to set free the German and Austrian armies on the Eastern front and to allow the full force of the Central Powers to be concentrated on the Belgian and French front, and over the Italian border, where the Austrians now broke through the Italian line and poured down over the Alpine passes into the valley of the Piave. Troops had at once to be rushed from other sorely menaced fronts to support the Italians in their difficult task of holding the plains against an enemy who held the hills.

Meanwhile, in 1915, an attack on the *Dardanelles* to eliminate Turkey and save Asia had been attempted by the British and French navies, using chiefly obsolete vessels of little value, recalled for that purpose from the China stations and elsewhere. This attack by sea failed with a heavy loss of ships. It was then realised, but too late, that to secure the objective of this expedition, namely the possession of the *Dardanelles* and the capture of Constantinople, land forces must occupy the Gallipoli peninsula and clear away the Turkish defensive fortifications before the

ships could pass through to the city walls. But when this now double expedition was launched in the April of 1915 it also failed. The loss of life at the landing on April 25th was terrible, the regiments finding it impossible to do much more than land and hold on to a bare set of beaches and a small group of trenches cut in rock. The naval demonstration in the February had given the Turks ample time to make their preparations for the military attack five months later. By December of 1915 this second expedition by land and sea was also acknowledged to have been a failure—but whether this was because the plan was ill conceived or merely ill-executed, experts of war still differ. Only the smoothly worked withdrawal of the troops without loss by night in December 1915 gave any show of success. This ended that attempt to reach Constantinople and drive Turkey to peace. Except as a manifesto of bravery and steadfastness, the expedition was an expensive failure.

From another quarter also an attempt was made on the Turkish dominions; this time by the Indian and British troops in *Mesopotamia* cutting up through the Persian Gulf to Bagdad. Ill-provided with commissariat, munitions, troops or medical aid, the combined forces marched north, their route all along contested with hard fighting; but though the army was successful in its advance, its line was too far from its base for safety; nor was it strong enough for its task of capturing and holding a position so distant from its supplies. After its victory near Bagdad the army had to fall back; the main attacking force of it was besieged at Kut and captured by German-led Turkish armies in April, 1916. Only after a year, when fuller preparation had been made, were the British and Indian forces, under General Maude, strong enough to move north effectively. In 1917 they captured Bagdad and held it securely till the end of the war.

The same procedure was followed to the east and north of *Egypt*, which, as soon as Turkey entered the war against England, had been declared free from Turkish suzerainty. A British force, again not strong enough for its task, moved over the frontier after beating back the invading Turkish army, and attacked, but failed to capture, Gaza, an old Philistine city at the gate of

Palestine. Twice Gaza was attacked by the British troops in 1917, and twice it held them off. A new expedition was only more successful when time had been given it to equip itself properly and to include a force sufficient for the enterprise. This time General Allenby, thus well provided, struck with decision, and after brilliant strategy captured Beersheba in October and entered Jerusalem in triumph in December of that same year, 1917.

At *Salonika* a mixed army of Servians, British, French and Greeks was landed and managed to hold just the port and the immediate country; but its power was limited to this, for it was hemmed in from any other advance by a Bulgarian army, strongly entrenched on the hills. There was little fighting on this front, but a long drawn watching of each by either side. *Salonika* was thus occupied partly in order that it might be a base for the hunted Serbian army, which had been driven out of its own territories by the invasion of Austrians and Bulgarians in the early days of the war, and partly to prevent its being used as a port by the Austrian or Turkish navy, and thus add a menace to naval operations or the movement of transports in the Eastern Mediterranean. Only at the end of the war was its real usefulness evident.

THE WESTERN FRONT

But the main fighting was along the far-flung stretch of trenches from the Flemish coast to the Swiss Alps, where Belgians, British, and French armies held their lines against the Germans till a final blow should decide which of the two confederacies was to conquer. The German advance on Paris had been thrown back almost within sight of the capital by a mistaken cross-march of the German commander on the extreme west of the line. So anxious had the Germans been in August and September 1914 to reach Paris that they had not consolidated their advance by moving slowly and holding carefully each centre that they occupied. The strategy intended had been a swift march, the capture of Paris, and then the dictation of peace to the allied nations of the west. It very nearly succeeded. But the German troops were thrown

back, and a line of defence established that gave to the war the peculiar character of a dreary and long drawn-out agony which seemed to offer no more hope than a stalemate. Flung back, the Germans began at once to "dig themselves in"; their opponents adopted the same method. Then it was realised that the war would not be one of movement, but of pressure, and that this would be due to the extremely mobile character of the forces engaged.

It is a paradox of military command that the more mobile the troops, the more stationary the fighting; where men move slowly there can be free play for movement because the advance of an army can only be slowly met. It has sometimes a chance to move, before its move can be seen, met or countered. But in this war every movement was almost instantly seen and replied to. Every attack was instantly met. Thus, the old ways of fighting were seen to be no longer valuable. This war was less of an open battle and more of a siege; only now citadels were defended, merely as bastions in a long wall. Hence, the war was fought almost solely in the trenches, with a few places like Ypres and Verdun as turning points in the massive defence of the line.

Therefore, apart from occasional attempts on each other's strongholds, the war consisted of a steady and active pressure brought to bear by each, and held against the other's line, and these lines were in some places only a few yards apart. Thus, since the troops were set so close over against each other and hidden in strongly excavated dug-outs, the type of ammunition had to be changed from that which had been used in more open warfare. Shrapnel, for instance, was found to be ineffective. High explosives were needed. This was only discovered by experience, and the repeated demands of the soldiers for this newer method of destruction took some time to be properly served.

In England the newspapers (usually heavily censored by the government) took up this demand of the soldiers and made it more vocal. As a result, the work of providing these new munitions was handed over to *David Lloyd George*, who now came prominently into public notice because of his driving power in getting things done and his dramatic quality in letting the

world know that it was he who was getting them done. The war, which had begun in England under the glamour of the name of Kitchener, who had been named minister of war at the outbreak and who was the popular idol, ended under the glamour of the name of Lloyd George, orator and politician.

The Germans had overrun *Belgium* from the moment of their first invasion of it, and this prevented much subsequent recruitment of Belgian soldiers, so that the Belgian army could never, as long as the war lasted, become effectively stronger than after their first disasters, nor even make good the losses it suffered. France was also partly occupied by the enemy from the beginning; and these occupied territories could thereafter give no additional man-power to France, so that the rest of the country was bled white. It was, in any event, outnumbered by Germany. The British army, therefore, was, alone, in a position to make up an effective force that could, by continual recruitment, keep the allied forces equal in man-power to their opposing armies. But delay was necessary before the small British army could be supplemented by new troops, disciplined and numerous enough to be of any service. It was compact and experienced, but compared with the continental armies it was very small. Lord Kitchener, who had been placed at the head of the War Office because of the confidence felt in him by the people and because of his reputation for soldierly qualities (rather than generalship), planned to create a British army on the continental scale; he was slow by nature and, moreover, set about this work with deliberate slowness. By the natural insight of a slow nature he foretold a long war. His work was ultimately successful (though in 1916 conscription was introduced into England), so that the force which he raised by purely voluntary enlistment numbered five millions of men. The military plan of the allied nations was, therefore, not to attempt to force a decision till their armies were numerically strong enough to do so, for against them was the populous conscript nation of Germany. But when they were strong enough to attempt this, the military problem had been completely altered by the trench warfare. It was now found difficult to break through the German line.

At first the small British forces had to be helped out by an Indian army, but the weather conditions in France and Flanders during autumn and winter proved impossible for these troops, accustomed to wholly different climates, and as soon as other troops could be substituted for them they were sent back to India or transferred to other seats of war. Other troops came from Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, Newfoundland and all "the dominions overseas" in their own separate contingents, and these, added to the numbers of the British force, enabled the empire to add a generous contribution to the forces of the alliance.

Meanwhile, the two lines faced each other in their trenches, each groping for the weak place in the other's line, feeling for a less well defended place to break through, capturing a position only to lose it, and the line swayed, but moved substantially in neither way. Eventually, spurred on by a grim necessity, the Germans made a desperate effort in 1918 to break through their adversaries at any cost. It was the gamble of men whose only chance lay in immediate success; to whom time was now an added enemy. Every fresh month of war would make things more difficult for them, so a risk had immediately to be taken. Hence, in 1918 the Germans made their maximum effort in Passion Week to hack their way through to Paris and to drive the opposing armies into the sea. The grim necessity that had spurred the Germans to their last venture was the steady *blockade of Germany by sea*. When the war opened the British fleet was so strong that the German fleet had no course open to it except to remain withdrawn in its harbours. At once, in accordance with the old policy, the British declared a blockade of Germany, and being in command of the sea, put again into force, as they had done many times before, under Cromwell and others, their claim to search all neutral vessels for contraband and to prevent the importation into Germany of food and materials for war. The Germans had, it is true, some ships still at large which dexterously turned themselves into armed raiders on British commerce and performed adventurous acts of daring. A German fleet even sunk a British fleet off the coast of Chile, only itself to be destroyed off

the Falkland Islands. But these piratical escapades were incidents that could not alter the course of the war.

This blockade of Germany, interpreted by the British as giving them "the right of search," roused antagonism from neutral nations, especially the Scandinavian countries, Spain and the United States. Of course, there were occasional raids on the English coasts by German vessels, and there were a few fights between parts of the enemy fleets, but there was no trial of strength between the two battle fleets till much later; so that at the beginning the British navy concentrated on this blockade. Against this the weapon of the Germans was very properly the *submarine*, and they used it most effectively both against warships and against ships of commerce. It achieved a very great success. At the beginning of the war it was more successful against warships than later, until, that is, new methods were discovered both of eluding submarines and of destroying them. Later, however, their chief value was in breaking the blockade of the English navy and threatening in turn a blockade of England. Here, for a long time, it was very nearly able to make good its claim, for it almost succeeded in cutting off supplies because of the very large number of ships it sunk. But in the end it was fairly countered. Towards the last months of the war the submarines were being sunk faster than they could be built. Once this point had been reached, the German high command knew their collapse was inevitable unless they could force a decision some other way.

Moreover, to worsen the German position, the *United States* now entered the war on the allied side. From the beginning, the sympathies of the United States had been divided, some favouring, some opposing, the allies. The political department of the German government was unable to keep the United States from entering the war, because the war department of the German government was set on the blockade of England by submarines, and was determined to enforce it at whatever hurt to the feelings of neutrals, just as England had enforced it even against the United States from the beginning of the war. But the submarine became inevitably a ruthless weapon whenever the ships captured

/

were too far off from Germany to be brought home. Consequently, while the British could search and capture neutral ships and take them unharmed into their ports, the Germans could only attack these neutral ships, or, if they demanded their surrender, then destroy them by sinking. If a fight developed, those on board were sometimes killed or drowned in the fight. Hence, while the British might occasionally anger neutrals by capturing their ships, the Germans revolted them into disgust and hostility by sinking their ships, and occasionally by drowning their crews.

Given the conditions of the submarine and the determination of the war leaders of Germany to enforce their blockade by submarine, then this was inevitable. Of all these ruthless drownings, the sinking of the *Lusitania* on May 7th, 1915, most dramatically impressed this on the United States, for it was a vessel carrying no munitions of war; it was sunk without warning off the coast of Ireland, and caused the loss of more than a thousand lives. Of these many were Americans. But it was not this that produced war between the two states. What it did, however, was to create a condition of public feeling which first made the United States realise the possibility of its having to enter the war. Once this had become clear—namely, that this was a possibility, everything from the German standpoint would now depend upon careful management of the possible occasions of conflict. But careful management was the last thing that Germany could think of when in wartime; her statesmen were overwhelmed by her military chiefs, and the occasions of conflict were in consequence handled with a reckless lack of consideration for neutrals. The United States were thus, by a series of tactless provocations, forced into war, and it was actually on Good Friday 1917 that President Wilson, thus, in the end, declared war on Germany.

Naturally, it took some time for the army of the United States to be properly drilled and ready for the front; then again, it had to be equipped with munitions, landed on the soil of France and acclimatised. But Germany woke at last in 1918 to the fact that the wealth of the United States, its immense and inexhaustible supplies of munitions and food, and above all its unlimited

man power, had entered against it and that already troops to the number of a million had been landed in France. At the same time Germany realised also that its submarine menace of the allies was losing its force. In early 1918, then, the high command knew that their last chance had come. It was then or never that that was possible. Now, before the United States could enter into the war with its proportionate power, was that last moment left to them in which a favourable decision was to be achieved.

No alternative was left. The contest at sea had failed. After many months of waiting, in 1916 the two fleets were for a short while engaged off Jutland in the only big sea-fight of the war. The *German navy* accomplished more than it had ever hoped to do; the British loss in ships and men was more severe than the German losses; yet though the battle had seemed to favour the Germans, it was the last scene of any German naval action. It showed that however successful the Germans might be, any loss on the German side was in proportion heavier than a greater loss on the British side. In Germany it was acclaimed a victory. But of such victories Germany could not afford to gain another. It ended the German naval effort. No more battleships were laid down to be built; the navy yards concentrated on building submarines.

Again, the *air-offensive* of Zeppelins over France and England, on which such hopes had been built, had also failed; at first sufficiently destructive, they were soon found to be an easy prey to quickly-devised methods of attack. Even the aeroplane as a raider of cities was found to be rather a weapon for terrifying the civil population than for achieving any grave military purpose. It was an attack, not on camps, but on cities, not on munitions, but on nerves.

The crisis was reached, therefore:

(i) When it began to be clearly recognised by Germany that American man power would soon overwhelm the Central Empires;

(ii) When the submarine blockade was being broken through;

(iii) When the German navy had been proved, at its best, to be indecisive;

(iv) When the air-attack had been found ineffectual.

It was therefore in March 1918 that the *last and greatest German offensive* was launched. Its immediate effect was to break through the British line and to force that part of the main line in France further and further inwards, to capture many prisoners, and to get possession of many hundreds of square miles of France. So near did the Germans now get to Paris that the population had every cause to be afraid of an actual siege. Even a great gun began to bombard the city, though at a considerable distance. We can now consider that the war had entered upon a new phase; it was no longer a question of fighting, but of sheer endurance. For how long would the civil population in France and England watch unmoved their armies marching backward, and watch without dismay? It was the one phase in the war when the ultimate hope of success or failure for the allied countries depended, not on the soldiers, but on the people. Had they grit enough to hold out? Hold out they did. No clamour for peace or surrender disturbed the home countries. The soldiers, of course, fought slowly and stubbornly, but they retreated steadily to the coast; still, while they fought stubbornly, the civil population stood to, uncowed.

Meanwhile, under the stress of this last pressure (as soon as it had begun, it was realised by the chiefs of the armies that this was the final hazard of the Germans), the allied armies were given a unified command under *General Foch*, a French officer of well-known skill in arms, a devoted Breton Catholic, whose religion had prevented his promotion at earlier stages in his career under the unpatriotic Freemasonry that then governed France. The strategy of Foch was simple enough. He did not attempt to make his counter stroke till the enemy had reached his maximum effort of attack and passed it, and had begun to fail. When that point were reached, and the German rush would have been exhausted and begun to falter, then at once he could strike the counter blows. Consequently it was not till July 18th that the armies were marshalled by Foch for the attack which opened with a mixed force of French and Americans. It was followed up by an advance of the British, and then separately again of the Americans. The

combination of these armies was admirably timed and the general strategy well carried out. Under its pressure the Germans had to retreat hurriedly over the very ground they had crossed so triumphantly in the spring. Driven from Amiens on August 8th, the German retreat at once extended over the whole line. Belgium was freed; Mons, whence the retreat of the British had begun in 1914, was again occupied by the British at the very end of the war. Four years had fallen between their first withdrawal and their return.

THE ENDING OF THE WAR

Already the Bulgarians had been forced to ask for terms of peace. The Servians pierced the line that surrounded the allies at Salonika and the Bulgarian resistance at once collapsed on 29th September, 1918.

Turkey, after losing Damascus and Aleppo under the attack of the Palestine army of General Allenby, surrendered unconditionally to the allies on October 21st.

Austria had already submitted to Italy that same month of October, after a series of victories in which General Diaz had broken the power and inclination of the never-much-interested new emperor, Charles (whose uncle had been assassinated at Serajevo).

Abandoned thus by its allies, Germany had no longer any reason for continuing the war. The speeches of President Wilson of the United States had echoed the appeal of Pope Benedict XV in 1917, and had offered terms to the Germans, partly specified in definite restorations of territory, and partly in the acceptance of definite general principles of public policy. But the President had also insisted that if he were asked to treat for peace with the Central governments, he would only treat with the civil, and not with the military leaders. Germany, therefore, faced with a need of asking for peace and supposing that the United States would be a less stern adversary than the other allied Powers (who had suffered so much more than their freshly engaged associated Power), saw in President Wilson its only hope, and thus found itself driven to effect, first, a political revolution. It knew it must

get rid of its war-lords. Under pressure from a group of soldiers and civilians, the Kaiser abdicated on November 9th and fled to Holland; the Kings of Bavaria, Saxony and Wurtemberg were dismissed. A German republic was proclaimed. Immediately the spirit of Lenin and his Communists, whom Germany had deliberately harboured in order to destroy Russia, now reacted on herself. Almost everywhere in the Central Empires the extremists nearly captured the incipient revolution; it was definitely captured for a while in Hungary and in parts of Bohemia, Austria and Germany. But the power of the moderating party everywhere eventually prevailed, though it very narrowly again escaped being overwhelmed during a reaction to Communism in 1923.

An *armistice*, based on the terms of President Wilson, was signed in a railway coach at Compiègne, on 11th November, 1918, the Germans accepting the Fourteen Points of President Wilson's offer as a preliminary to the final treaty of peace. To the enormous relief of the civilized world on that day ended the booming of the guns and the heavy loss of human life.

The chief items of the Fourteen Points were

- (i) The evacuation of Belgium.
- (ii) The restoration to France of Alsace and Lorraine.
- (iii) The creation of a free and autonomous Poland.
- (iv) Equal trading rights for all nations.
- (v) The freedom of the seas.
- (vi) A general reduction of armaments.
- (vii) The establishment of the League of Nations.
- (viii) Self-determination for the smaller nations.
- (ix) Open covenants between nations to be openly arrived at and an end put to secret diplomacy.

The treaty of peace, however, was a very difficult affair to adjust, for by November 1918 the number of Powers who had declared war on Germany and were, therefore, to participate in the framing of the treaty, included almost the whole civilised world. At the end five-sixths of the inhabitants of the globe had been technically in a state of war.

CONTEMPORARY IMPRESSIONS

We can now fitly catalogue the contemporary impressions of the war:

(i) It was the immensity of the field of the war that was its first characteristic; it had been really a world-war.

(ii) It was a world-war again in another sense, for the armies were not the armed forces of the nations, but really the nations-in-arms. Conscription on all those engaged in the fight had swept in every one able to fight or work. There was hardly a civil population at all at the war's end.

(iii) No doubt, the general cause of the war was the unrest created by the scrambling of all the nations for commerce in foreign markets, and, therefore, the increasing of armaments to protect this commerce in these markets. For some years, however, the older nations were willing enough to rest on what they had already annexed and were defending by their armaments; Germany (come more recently into the assembly of the important nations), however, was not going to be content till (a) she was as great on the sea as any sea power, and (b) as great on land as any land power. She had refused the offer of the others to come to an agreement limit to all armaments, because she thought the others were only doing this out of jealousy of her growing dominance and to keep her down, and she was not yet ready herself to agree to remain at a lower strength, and would wait till she had reached the height which she thought commensurate with her power. All sorts of reasons brought the various nations into the war.

(iv) (a) The immediate cause of the entrance of Great Britain and her dominions into the conflict was the invasion of Belgium. Just before the war began, the French ambassador tried to persuade the English secretary of state for foreign affairs to inform Germany directly that England would fight if France were attacked. But the British government refused to say this, because they were by no means willing to pledge themselves to this. There was no certainty of England entering the contest, since there was no alliance with France binding her

to do so. But the invasion of Belgium by the German army (to defend the neutrality of which England and Germany had both pledged themselves in 1831) compelled Great Britain, by the force of her obligations, to join in a war which her people soon discovered was also a war of self-defence. Had Belgium not been invaded it would have been impossible for a Liberal government to have declared war on Germany. (b) The United States had been flouted into the war, as the enemy of Germany, by want of tact. The handling of its foreign relations by that empire had been conspicuously unwise. (c) Had Belgium not been invaded, it does not appear likely that Belgium would have been involved in the war, for half her population is Flemish, and of recent years the Flemings have been usually more in sympathy with Germany than with France. (d) The antagonism of France and Germany dated back half a century and more, and Alsace and Lorraine were bitter reminders of this to both. (e) Italy, despite the Triple Alliance, had always resented the Austrian occupation of lands whose race and language were Italian, the *Italia irredenta*, the Italy "as yet unredeemed."

Again, in the cases of the protagonists in this quarrel, viz., Austria and Russia, there was a separate cause of hostility in their mutual claim on the hegemony of the Balkans. In effect Austria dictated to Servia, Russia refused to allow this dictation, Germany came to the aid of Austria, France to the aid of Russia (both Germany and France being bound to do this by treaty obligations). Italy refused to look on this war as "a war of defence," and therefore did not consider it to fall under the terms of the Triple Alliance, and remained neutral till it seemed that by intervening on the allied side she could win back her Austrian lands.

(v) The opening of the war broke down all the domestic divisions within the belligerent countries; in France, the Catholics, the priesthood, and the Socialists rallied to the government; in Germany, the Socialists also accepted the government programme; in England, the Irish question and the Suffrage for Women campaign and the intensely strained

political situation between Lords and Commons were all immediately quieted.

(vi) The war itself soon developed into a war of scientific inventions—the aeroplane, submarine, “tank,” etc.; there were the scientific inventions, too, of more deadly explosives, of poison-gas, of other new machines of destruction. Hence, as a result of this exploitation of science, the loss of life was enormous and the maimed and mutilated by war were in a higher proportion in this fighting than ever before. But science also devoted itself to healing the wounds it had caused, and medical science and surgery also made much progress under the very conditions of the war. New operations were able to be tried on a large scale, and new methods of relieving pain when dealing with cases which otherwise would have ended fatally. Where the proposed treatment could not worsen matters, the doctors were led to experiment.

(vii) But the general prevailing conception of the peoples engaged in the war was that the chief result of the war would be to increase the freedom of mankind and to diminish injustice, “to make the world safe for democracy”, and each country “a place fit for heroes to dwell in”. With these large hopes the war was fought, and, under the impression that they were gained, was peace made.

THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES

On 28th June, 1919, at Versailles in the very Hall of Mirrors in which the German empire had been proclaimed in 1871, the peace was signed. The terms of the peace were largely the work of President Wilson, acting for the United States, of Georges Clemenceau for France (he had been a member of the Commune in 1871, but his premiership of France from 1917 onwards had given her political stability, by importing to her political life a driving energy that ensured victory), of David Lloyd George for England, and of Orlando for Italy. Japan was not much interested, except in securing for herself the possessions hitherto held by Germany in China. These four, then, were principally responsible for the treaty; four very different men. Orlando was the least forcible,

with the result that Italy fared far less well than the others. She was bitterly disappointed, for she judged that she should have fared better after all her efforts, her sacrifices, and her final victories; Lloyd George was shrewd and emotional, without much knowledge of geography or history; better at handling men than problems; not a thinker with definite principles, but much at the mercy of arguments couched in the language of distress. In France and in sight of devastated country he was most fierce in his denunciations of Germany. When he heard of the distress of Germany he was equally moved to advocate a more generous treatment of her by the allies. Had he had definite principles and clear and constant views, he could have managed the others and set his stamp on the treaty. He had the power to do so but not the plan. Woodrow Wilson had the principles and the plan, but he lacked the power to persuade. He could not manage men. Also, he was ignorant of, or he ignored, European history. He judged men as though they were machines. Hence, when he could dictate, as in the condition he imposed on the treaty of the League of Nations, he was successful; when he argued he could seldom gain his point. He irritated alike by his insistence and by his ignorance. An idealist who is both authoritative and ignorant is better away from discussions. Clemenceau was the best of the four, in that he knew what he wanted and on what principles. He was old, he had always been a fighter, he was not a Christian, he was by sympathy and political allegiance a Socialist, he was usually silent, but when he spoke his words cut. He wanted the territory of Alsace and Lorraine (there was no difficulty here), he wanted Germany to be constrained and militarily occupied, he wanted a strong Poland on the far side of Germany to take the place which Russia had held in French policy and could no longer hold, he wanted a very large indemnity, and he wanted the French influence to be paramount in the East. His Eastern policy was not favourably received by England, and his insistence on a long military occupation of Germany was opposed by the President of the United States.

The main features of the peace treaty had been foreshadowed by Wilson's "*fourteen points*," the basis of the armistice, and,

therefore, included the independence of Poland, the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France, and the disarmament of Germany as a preliminary to the general disarmament of the world. A final feature of the Wilsonian policy was the League of Nations. It was forced into the treaty by the President of the United States, only later to be rejected by the United States Congress, which, on this very account, refused to accept the treaty or to ratify it. The other items included the erection of the new States of Czecho-Slovakia (an enlarged Bohemia), of Jugo-Slavia (an enlarged Serbia), and of various new independent republics, Finland, Lithuania, Livonia, Esthonia, etc. Also, the payment of a war-indemnity (to be fixed subsequently) was included—to be paid by the enemy Powers to the allied nations.

RESULTS OF THE WAR

But the treaty carried within it causes of its own unworkableness:

(i) The Czecho-Slovakian government, the Jugo-Slavian, the Roumanian and the Polish, were all given districts which included races and languages other than their own. Even in its dismemberment, Austria carried on the hereditary troubles of the old Empire into these four new States. The Czechs and Poles were set to rule German territories—once indeed not German, originally Bohemian or Polish, but by this time, after years of German conquest (however unjust), impregnated with German ways. Roumania was given districts in Hungary where similar conditions prevailed. Thus, the treaty itself was bound to cause incessant troubles, since it violated its supposed principle of autonomy for race and language.

(ii) Italy saw itself with little or no gains beyond the Trentino; it desired the opposite shore of the Adriatic; it coveted Fiume and the adjacent harbours which in time of war might be used to threaten her eastern seaboard.

(iii) It was found by experience that Germany could only pay the indemnity if she were rich and prosperous. Hence, though the indemnity was intended to cripple her, it was discovered that if she were crippled, she could not pay it, and

besides she would become a drag on the prosperity of Europe. Hence, her indemnity, as originally settled, had to be scaled down. Moreover, the question of the indemnity was further complicated by the debts owed to each other of the Allied nations. Before the United States entered the war, the other nations had borrowed from England. After the United States had entered the war, England and the others borrowed from the United States. These debts were paid for by government bonds, in which the people of the United States had invested money, and on which, therefore, the United States considered itself bound to demand the required interest: hence, while:

The defeated nations had heavy indemnities to pay;

The victorious nations had debts to pay almost as heavy.

Moreover, the defeated nations could not afford to pay their indemnities, which were, therefore, scaled down to suit their capacities;

Yet the victorious nations had still to pay their debts or fund them to be paid later, and there was no scaling down for them.

(iv) The result of all this was a financial collapse in Europe; the exchanges of the mark, franc, lira, etc., fell away to nothing, exactly as the bankers had foretold before the war began. When war seemed imminent in 1914, the bankers, headed by Lord Rothschild, had made a deputation to Lloyd George, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, urging him to oppose the war in the cabinet since international finance was so closely inter-related and so delicate that, whichever side won, the whole of Europe would be in financial distress. The prophecy had come true. After two years of boom in trade, immediately following the peace, due to the need for many manufactured articles which had not been produced during the war (for four years munitions only, etc. had been manufactured), there came a reaction. There were no outside markets rich enough to take the goods of the nations with undisturbed currencies, for those whose currencies were disturbed could not pay the exchange rates; indeed, in any event, apart from exchanges, they were

poor. The result was financial dislocation, poverty, and distress all over Europe.

(v) In turn, this provoked social dislocation. The spirits of many of those who chafed against the inequalities of life under which they suffered had been stirred by hearing of the Russian Revolution. It produced abroad much the same disturbing effect as the French Revolution had done in the era of the Napoleonic wars. After all, the war had been fought for freedom and democracy. Here, it seemed, were democracy and freedom *in excelsis*. Men forgave its blood-record of murder in the remembrance of the old tyranny of the Tsar, and of the half-barbaric nature of the Russians themselves. Moreover, in the war, the strongest empires in Europe had gone down: if these had been pushed over, what could withstand a national will? Again, the new mob in the cities had very recently been a disciplined soldiery, trained to shoot, grown callous to facing death, and no longer sensitive to the value of human life. Everywhere, too, the social revolution was further stimulated by the sight of the "profiteer," who had grown wealthy on the risks of others in war. Everywhere, therefore, a social upheaval was threatening. It culminated in strikes and civil war. The general strike in England in 1926 was the peak of that general disturbance; after that was over, affairs were much quieter again.

(vi) Moreover, it was everywhere evident that the old principles of domestic life had also been at least temporally overthrown. The war had stirred all human passions, for no one passion can be excited without the others being excited too. There followed on it a period in which the old social ties and domesticities were dislocated. Girls who had been asked officially, and repeatedly, during the war to lay aside the ideals of an earlier generation, and to take an active part in the business life of the nation were now thoroughly emancipated. After the war, gradually withdrawn from the posts they had occupied (as the men were demobilised and needed openings), the new women had no longer the same amount of work and

crowded hours as they had for four years; but yet, having once tasted the interest and excitement of work, they naturally did not wish to go back to their old ways. Their home life, after this, seemed to them very flat. Moreover, they disliked being pushed back under a yoke of obedience, and being subject again to questioning as to where they had been and what done. This had only been tolerable as long as it was customary and unchallenged. They now protested against this "tyranny", and infected their younger sisters with the same revolt against it. They rebelled and refused to be kept "in thrall". The young man of the time was, of course, what the young woman made him. This "new girl", therefore, had fashioned a "new boy".

(vii) It will have been remembered that the "eighteen-nineties" had been a protest and a mockery against the old Victorian complacent compromise. The brilliant artists, poets, writers, dramatists and critics had attacked its conventions very fiercely, and had urged that its spirit was philistine and dull. Their gospel needed as its preliminary crusade to destroy confidence in old authorities. When the war came, its spirit clinched their arguments, and henceforward the old authorities were authorities no more. Was it not these "old authorities" who had unleashed the war? Was not the profiteer the logical product of the political economy of the Universities, where men for two generations had been taught that the principle of profit in commerce was to buy cheap and sell dear? Were not the evils against which "labour" had come to protest, the result of a set of principles which had deliberately allowed these evils in the name of a theory spun by professors, remote from the life of the age? But the war not only clinched the arguments of the "eighteen-nineties," and made the new generation throw over irrevocably the Victorian ideals and principles, but also logically made them throw over the ideals and principles of the "eighteen-nineties" as well. These also were, by the end of the war, "ancient history". Ibsen and Bernard Shaw and Anatole France were now thrown over for the very same reasons which they had used when advocating the throwing over of the

Victorian classics: to a child his father seems as old as his grandfather, to a child all grown-up people are too old. To the children of the post-war generation, everything pre-war was too old. Again, because of the very conditions of life, for four years there had been little progress or even life in European music or criticism. But the United States had stood longer out of the sweep of the war than the rest of the allies, and so the artistic and musical talent of the United States now became the standard of Europe, to wit—syncopated music and free verse. The post-war civilisation was the civilisation of the United States, which was in turn the “negro triumphant.” This was to be seen as much in the bright colouring introduced into the clothes of the men, as in the “nigger spirituals,” or in the jazz music. Moreover, the new art required less skill and less discipline than the old had done: hence, the proportion of incompetency in the art world was higher than ever before. There was as much fine work being done as usual, but more work of the lower grade than usual. This reacted into the whole domain of thought, of political science, of education: the old authorities were gone, indeed all authority had gone, which meant that all tradition had been broken, which meant that the evolution of the world’s thought was interrupted. The life of Europe was left in suspended animation till people became sane enough to come back to what was the heritage of Western life.

POST-WAR EUROPE

By 1920, a new world seemed emerging everywhere in Europe; the world that had been made safe for democracy was paradoxically beginning to be distrustful of democracy, especially when it was organised in the form of parliamentary government. Yet it certainly remained shy of kings. In 1920, *Hungary*, for an example, held a meeting of its National Assembly and passed two resolutions: First, it declared itself a monarchy and voted Admiral Horthy the regent or protector of the monarchy; secondly, it refused to appoint, nominate, or declare its monarch. The allied nations had indeed forbidden a Hapsburg to sit on the throne of Hungary, so the Emperor Charles, who was the natural heir,

could not succeed; moreover, the Little Entente, as it was called (Czecho-Slovakia, Jugo-Slavia, and Poland), had been formed amongst other purposes, precisely to prevent the return of the Hapsburgs, and Hungary could not act against the declared will of these three. Nevertheless, the Emperor crossed the frontier and appeared before the royal palace in Budapest, where Horthy resided, and demanded to be accepted as King of Hungary; Horthy refused to accept him till a vote of the National Assembly had been taken. Before that could happen, Charles was captured and sent across to his exile. In 1921, he again entered Hungary, this time with the Empress Zita, and by aeroplane. He rallied some troops and tried by force to become king, thinking that the people would gather to his standard. They did not gather to him; he was defeated and exiled to Madeira, where almost immediately he died.

It is more true to take as a symptom of the new spirit of 1920, the fact that Masaryk, already president of the Czecho-Slovakian republic, was elected president for life. More than to any other man, the Republic owed its existence to him. An agricultural country, rich and prosperous, it had flourished so well since the war as to be able to loan money to Austria. Austria, too, in that year of settlement (1920), became a republic, with Vienna as a capital too large to be supported by the territory which it now ruled; on this account, because the country could not financially provide for its capital, the republic of Austria had to be rescued from bankruptcy by a loan from the League of Nations. It was also in 1920 that Mustapha Kemal took charge of the Nationalist government of *Turkey* at Angora and destroyed the Caliphate, breaking deliberately the spiritual unity of Mohammedanism for the sake of defending the individuality of the state. Fashioning the Turkish state on the principles of the Protestant Reformation (because in his eyes Protestantism had curbed the independence of the spiritual power and made it subservient to the civil power), he followed the policy of the Reformers by establishing a national "Church" in the Turkish Empire, and translating the Koran—the first time officially—from Arabic into Turkish, the "vulgar tongue." By the treaty of Angora in 1923, he forced Europe to

restore to Turkey, Constantinople and the districts which had been mandated to Greece by the League of Nations.

In 1922, Lloyd George's post-war ministry in *England* fell. It had been a Coalition government, following the procedure of a union of all parties, which had for patriotic reasons been adopted during the war. On its defeat the Conservatives succeeded to office (first under Bonar Law and then in 1923 under Stanley Baldwin), but only to give way to the Labour party under the premiership of Ramsay Macdonald (1923-1924), whose foreign policy was little different from his predecessors, except in his recognition of the Russian government, which his party looked upon as the great achievement of their rule. Yet they lost the following general election through the publication (i) of a letter of a Russian Minister, which showed him to have tried to corrupt the Labour Party, and (ii) of Macdonald's answer, in which he charged the Russian government with having broken its promise not to interfere with British domestic politics. The Conservatives were returned with a very large majority in 1924.

In 1923, *Spain* was heavily defeated by the Riffs in Morocco. It was realised, however, that this military failure was due principally to the lack of preparation on the part of the inefficient and corrupt home government. In September, therefore, one of the Generals, Primo de Rivera, Governor of Barcelona, took command of his city in the name of the people, overset the government, and made himself Prime Minister and civil dictator under the King of Spain. The war against the Riffs was now waged vigorously and successfully; Spain had peace without and within.

The same sort of inefficiency and corruption was leading *Italy* through a campaign of wholesale murder to chaos and break up of all order. In 1922, Mussolini, therefore, at the head of his Fascisti, made his march on Rome, and was declared dictator by a decree of the King in October of that year. In 1925, Hindenburg became President of the German Republic; a year earlier, in Russia, Lenin, the leader of the Revolution there, died. But in spite of his death the Soviet system (a declared dictatorship and not a parliamentary government) continued. It was a tyranny, deliberately meant to be so.

The wheel had turned full cycle since the war. The world that "had been made safe for democracy" had not now even the forms of democracy left, except in a few of the great states. In *France* even, where it did survive, the *Action Française* desired to establish in its place a dictatorship by a *coup d'état*; it boasted that it could do this whenever it wished and without bloodshed. It claimed however that the reason why it did not establish a dictatorship was a grave one. It had no one it could think of who would make a good dictator. All that saved France from the dangers of the experiment, was its complete lack of the breed whence tyrants are sprung.

IRELAND

As far as England was concerned, her European troubles chiefly centred round Ireland, where the proclamation at the end of the war of the self-determination of peoples (amongst the Fourteen Points of Woodrow Wilson) was interpreted as a promise of self-government also to the Irish. To realise the condition of things in Ireland to which thus new hope was given, it is necessary to go back to 1913, when a strike in Dublin, organised by labour leaders of revolutionary tendencies, James Larkin and James Connolly, divided the political forces of Ireland again into two groups of politicians, the Constitutional and Revolutionary. In 1914, the Constitutional party, headed by the Irish Nationalist members of the British Parliament, declared their support of the allied cause in the war. Meanwhile, the Irish Volunteers, a military organisation, had also been formed partly to counteract the Ulster military organisation (developed by Sir Edward Carson against the threatened Home Rule Bill introduced by the Liberal government in England in 1912) and partly to satisfy the Irish demand for some organisation, by which one day to extort Home Rule from the English. It had been some years in existence, but on the division of the party after the strike it was also divided, some of the Volunteers following the Constitutional Nationalists and forming the nucleus of the recruitment for the war, and some of them following the revolutionary leaders, Pearse and Connolly, the last having been the chief originator of the Dublin Strike of

1913. Moreover, two other organisations joined up with the Revolutionary Volunteers, the Citizen Army and the Gaelic League—this last originally founded to preserve and foster the Irish language, and to educate the people towards a revival of the old Irish culture, which the English invasion had interrupted and in great measure destroyed.

The leaders of this revolutionary movement were convinced that the Irish were becoming anglicised, and feared that the enthusiasm for the war on behalf of England against the military dictatorship of Germany, would break down the opposition of the Irish to the English dominance of their country; they looked about for some means to estrange England and Ireland, and to convert the pro-war and anti-German majority into a minority, because they believed intensely that else the real Irish heart and spirit would be destroyed. Here, Sir Roger Casement, then in Germany, hoped to further their plans by organising, amongst the Irish prisoners of war, an Irish Brigade, which should be landed by German ships on the Irish coast and raise an armed rebellion against the British rule. But, while Germany was willing to lend officers (whom the Irish did not want) to help this rebellion, it was not in a position to give much other aid, since the sea could not be traversed by German transports without the certainty of their being destroyed by the British. Thus, the Irish Brigade, even if it were to exist in any numbers, could not be brought to Ireland. Also, Casement gradually realised that the German Foreign Office did not believe in the possibility of the success of the insurrection, and were not interested in the freedom of Ireland except for the sake of making trouble for England. Eventually, at his repeated request, Sir Roger Casement was landed, with two others, on the Irish coast from a German submarine. He came, however, with the express purpose of preventing the insurrection, having, meanwhile, become convinced that it could not succeed. The British Secret Service had however followed the course of the negotiations between Casement and his Irish Brigade, and between Casement and the German Foreign Office. He was expected, therefore, and caught within a few hours of landing, and later was hanged.

Despite this effort to prevent the insurrection, Pearse and Connolly determined to proceed with it, not because they (any more than Casement) believed it had any chance of military success, but because they believed it would fail and be so ruthlessly dealt with by the British government, that public feeling in Ireland would swing round to sympathy with the defeated and martyred cause. Pearse knew his Ireland. Therefore, during *Easter week*, 1916, under the inspiration of these two, the rebellion took place. It is said by those most competent to know, that only 1,500 people took an active part in it. All the leaders of it were captured and shot: the suppression of it was immediate and complete, but so ruthless that the Irish, as Pearse and Connolly had expected, swung round to favour that which at the beginning the majority had condemned. Swiftly, the nation as a whole deserted the Constitutional Nationalist Party to support the rival policy of Sinn Fein. Before 1916, the Sinn Fein had been chiefly concerned with economics. Under Arthur Griffith it had refused to support the revolution or to use force. It was the historic successor of the principles of Daniel O'Connell, but included in its programme the hope of the establishment of an Irish republic. Of the same spirit was now also the Fianna Eireann, an organisation for boys on the analogy of the English Scout movement, to develop the boys educationally and physically, and to afford a feeding ground or recruiting field for the Irish Volunteers. This swing of the nation from the Constitutional to the Revolutionary group, was made visible at the election of 1918, when the Coalition Government of Great Britain appealed to the electorate: in Ireland only two of the Constitutional party were returned to Westminster, the other seventy-one members elected were members of the Sinn Fein. Pledged to secure a republic, these refused to go to Westminster, opened a Parliament of their own in Dublin, and elected de Valera (an Irish-American) President of the Republic.

The political department of the revolution, therefore, was now the *Sinn Fein party*; the military department consisted of (a) the Irish Volunteers (now comprising also the Citizen Army), (b) the Fianna Eireann as a junior section, (c) the Cumann

nam Ban, a women's section, to assist the other two branches. Gradually, the situation developed into a guerilla-war against the British. First, the Volunteers and Sinn Fein were banned by law; they retaliated by shooting the police and attacking the barracks. Arthur Griffith, their leader, however, still opposed the use of force on behalf of Irish independence. However, taxes were not paid to the government, nor were the courts of justice attended by the disputants; but instead the taxes were paid to the Sinn Fein authorities and its courts appealed to in dispute. By 1921, the British troops and constabulary were withdrawn to a few centres, and the fighting became more fierce. Towns were burnt and a policy of reprisals was developed on both sides. All this was successfully used by the Irish for propaganda on behalf of their ideals, both in the United States and in Europe.

In 1921, the pressure brought to bear on Lloyd George, the British Prime Minister, by the Dominions oversea, and by public opinion at home and abroad, was so great that he proposed a truce to the Irish to see whether some compromise could not be arrived at; it is clear now that many in the Sinn Fein party were all the time opposed to the use of force, and that many more intended the demand for an independent republic to be used merely as a lever to secure Dominion Home Rule. Because of these facts, five representatives were nominated by de Valera on 16th September, 1921, and chosen from among the Sinn Fein party heads (Arthur Griffith and Michael Collins being the most important of them, the last a picturesque personality, whose adventurous exploits against the British had given him the greatest possible public prestige), to meet the British representatives, the foremost being Lloyd George and Lord Birkenhead. The meetings lasted for two months. It was soon found that the great stumbling block was the Partition Act of 1920 which separated Ulster from the rest of Ireland. The Dail conferred on the five representatives plenipotentiary powers. A few members of the Dail were for tying the hands of the plenipotentiaries, but de Valera declared that he and his colleagues would resign if this were attempted. After much going backwards and forwards on the part of the delegates to visit de Valera (who now declared that

he was no "doctrinaire republican") in Ireland, and then to return to the British representatives in Westminster, one midnight (6th December, 1921), a treaty, composed and agreed to by all those present, was finally signed. De Valera immediately denied that the five representatives from Ireland had the proper power to sign the treaty, and repudiated it: the five declared that he had approved of their signing it. It was the word of one man against five. The treaty secured for Ireland a Dominion Home Rule more advanced than even Canada had received: but in his repudiation of the treaty, the alleged main cause of de Valera's hostility was that the six northern counties of Ulster were cut off from the Free State (as it was to be called); this and the oath of allegiance to the King of Great Britain, more than anything, were declared to be the causes of a new civil war which now followed. A long and protracted debate in the Dail, or Republican Parliament, was ended by a vote on the treaty, which was carried by a majority of seven votes. De Valera at once resigned his presidency and began to organise armed forces.

A general election took place in Ireland in 1922, in which both parties agreed the treaty was not to be the issue of the contest: after the election, Collins and Griffith formed a provisional government and started a national army, to which most of the headquarter staff of the Irish Republic Army was transferred. But many of the men who were in possession of the evacuated barracks of the British Army (evacuated from Ireland under the terms of the treaty), and who followed the fortunes of de Valera, refused to surrender them to the new State troops. After many conferences between the Free State and the Republican Army to arrive at some compromise had failed to reach an agreement, the Free State proclaimed the Republican Army as illegal, holding it to be impossible to allow an armed force within its borders which refused to obey its commands. In June 1922, fighting developed between the two forces, which ended in *civil war*. The objections of the Republican Army to the Free State were:

- (i) The oath of allegiance to the King of Great Britain and the Dominions to be taken by all who sat in the Dail or Parliament.

(ii) The partition of Ireland, due to the treaty's exclusion of Ulster from the Free State until it should desire to enter it of its own will. No alternative solution was offered, however, by the Republicans, except the forcible reduction of the north.

(iii) The withdrawal of the demand for a republic and the acceptance by the Irish of the status of Dominion Home Rule.

De Valera now engaged in this civil war against the Free State with an intensity which was all the fiercer, since the Free State military chiefs were in possession of all the secret devices that had been developed against the British. After three months, the Republican army, smaller than its opponents, had to withdraw from fighting in the open, and its old tactics used against the British were now resumed: shootings, reprisals, and executions. But in 1923, the Republicans were still further reduced in strength and munitions, after nearly twelve months of war, so that orders were issued to cease fire. (i) The clergy had been on the whole on the side of the constitutional government; (ii) Labour was largely indifferent; (iii) the resources of the Free State were more ample than those of their opponents; and (iv) the nation was tired of the years of war.

A general election was again held in 1923; the result of which was that the deputies were grouped as follows:

Government	-	-	-	68
Republicans	-	-	-	44
Farmers	-	-	-	16
Labour	-	-	-	12
Independents	-	-	-	12

But even now, the Republicans refused to take the oath (since this had been one of their reasons for refusing the treaty and for fighting the civil war), and therefore the Dail continued to sit without them. Their absence reduced the legislative assembly to a single party and weakened the authority of government, but the Free State went slowly forward—developing its agriculture and education—under its new president Cosgrave, for meanwhile Griffith had died suddenly of heart failure and Michael Collins had been shot in a skirmish with the Republican troops. In 1924,

the Free State felt itself strong enough to begin releasing all its political prisoners: a new attempt was immediately made by de Valera to re-organise his armed forces from these returned followers of his who were once more free. In 1925, the government of Ireland, after watching this re-organisation of an armed force, deliberately independent of the civil control of the State, determined again to impose its authority. Following the policy of all civil constitutional authorities, they ordered it to be disbanded, and on its refusal again resorted to its forcible suppression; some of the Free State troops mutinied, but the government dismissed these officers at once, and the mutiny failed.

Again foiled in his violent policy, de Valera now turned towards constitutional methods; with the result that Sinn Fein immediately divided into two new camps. De Valera undertook to accept the government on condition of the abolition of the oath, while the rest of Sinn Fein, faithful to its original policy, refused to follow him, rejected every compromise, and continued its protest to the three points which de Valera himself had formulated. To prevent this split, however, affecting the Republican military organisation, the army (which still continued to exist) withdrew itself from the authority both of de Valera and his opponents in the Sinn Fein group, and became a purely military organisation under its own army council and executive staff. In 1927, de Valera abandoned his last remaining objection to the treaty which had been the cause of all his fighting, and now declared that the oath meant nothing of importance and was a mere form. He and his followers, therefore, declaring that their sworn word meant nothing, entered the Dail, and after an election of intense excitement in 1927, re-entered the Dail in almost equal numbers with the Free State government. Hence, in Ireland, there are three parties—one that accepted the Constitution from the day of the treaty, another which refused the Constitution, but has now sworn to abide by it and to be loyal to the Sovereign of Great Britain, and a third which both refused the Constitution and refused to take the oath to it: besides these parties, there exists a Republican army which professes itself independent of all three.

INDIA AND EGYPT

In India and Egypt, something of the same sort happened—the rising of the tide of Nationalism, Zaghloul in Egypt leading the revolt. In 1922, the British protectorate ended, and Fuad I was declared king of an independent sovereign State. But there were three points (despite this independence) which were reserved by England for special further negotiation: the Suez Canal zone, the protection of foreigners, and the Sudan. After some violent political agitation, the British Sirdar was murdered in 1924. In satisfaction for this crime England declared that an indemnity must be paid, an official apology made, and the British claim to the Sudan more definitely stated. Egypt could only agree: she first, however, appealed to the League of Nations against having to accept these terms, but England there declared that the dispute was a domestic one, and not referable to the League. The position is still obscure.

India, similarly under various leaders, has clamoured for independence in order (say, the vocal politicians) to achieve nationality; in order (say, the spiritual revolutionaries) to save its soul. But the problems of India are very delicate and only gradually to be solved, for it is not a nation but a continent, and the granting of Home Rule would not be possible without, as an immediate result, the collapse of all law and order. The agitators are Bengalis: the other provinces despise the Bengalis, who talk, reason, argue, but who would not fight. Were Home Rule given, the north would break away; few of the native princes who rule vast territories would allow any popular assemblies in their dominions; the Mohammedans and Hindus would be with difficulty kept apart. The actual measure of Home Rule granted is being gradually extended, but the organisation of a land of races, religions, castes and stages of culture as diverse as those of India, is a task that will take a very long time to perfect. The memory of the impeachment of Warren Hastings, and of the fine line of viceroys, is a testimony to the generally unselfish record of the British administration of India since India came under the jurisdiction of the British Crown.

THE ECLIPSE OF LIBERALISM

It will be seen, therefore, that on every side the immediate effect of the war has been the break-up of the old conditions of life, or at least of its old quietudes. First, this took place under the inspiration of the new nationalism resulting from the principle of self-determination, which had been declared a purpose of the war, and therefore, its inevitable result; then as the new nationalism developed, it served sometimes as a cloak for revolutionary movements, which by the word "self-determination" meant really the rising tide of Communism. Secondly, the complete destruction of law and order to which this led, produced in effect a reaction in favour of settled government at the cost of the newer liberties. Mussolini, for instance, succeeded to the fumbling policies of his predecessors and produced results which seemed to those, who had tasted both forms of government, to be worth more than the older ideals had been able to effect. To many in Italy, no doubt, the new way was a way of tyranny: but then the old way had also been a way of tyranny—that is, the suppression of what the populace desired, religion, justice, free opportunity for all, and no special privileges for the government officials.

It must not be supposed, however, that this newer concentration of power in the hands of a dictator was altogether a new movement, or that it ran counter to the whole of the Liberal tendencies of the generation before the war. In the very heart of the Liberal movement there had been many on the Continent who had spoken disrespectfully of "the people", and who had yet claimed to speak in the peoples' name. Montalambert, one of the group of Liberal Catholics (his great friend, the Dominican preacher, Lacordaire, had described him as "a penitent Catholic and an impenitent Liberal"), had much to say on the dangers of mere popular government, and had his grave doubts, which the later experience of his life wholly seemed to justify, whether "the people" were competent, or could ever become competent, to govern themselves, and still more whether this self-government was best attempted through a representative assem-

bly or through a monarch or an oligarchy. Like the scholastic teachers of the thirteenth century, he came at the end of his life to proclaim that it was not so much the system of government as the spirit of government that mattered, and that it was possible to have a popular monarchy more sensitive and responsive to national feeling than a republic. In France, too, the school of Auguste Comte, the Positivist, maintained, in the phrase of their master, "the sovereignty of the people is an oppressive mystification, and equality is an ignoble lie." Yet, Comte and his followers were amongst the liberalising forces of France. From that school, came Ferdinand Brunetière, one of the earliest of the great French "converts" (writer, lecturer, critic, novelist), who turned to Catholicism as the fulfilment of his "positive" philosophy, and to Christ as the divine incarnation of that humanity which Comte had taught him to worship. It was this fulfilment in Catholicism of their outside-bred ideals, that moved the intellectuals towards the Church in France. Yet, though most of them were Liberals and democrats, many of them were not in favour of the parliamentary form of government: Paul Bouget and Claudel were two other writers who were also converts, Liberals, and were yet not satisfied with representative government.

Much earlier, Paul Déroulède (with his intellectual followers, Maurice Barrès and Charles Maurras) had gone even further. For him the chief need of France was for a strong central government. Only thus, he judged, were peace, freedom, and justice to be obtained. Hence, Déroulède's teaching developed into the *Action Française*, itself part of a wider European movement in favour of a union between Church and State under a religiously safeguarded monarchy, with this defect, however, inherent in it, of insisting on the Church not as a spiritual teacher, but an ethical police.

In Spain, however, the movement that led towards the dictatorship had had much literature behind it; but it was chiefly religious, Catholic, and anti-democratic: its main writer was Jacinto Benavente.

RUSSIA

This reaction against the extreme liberalising ideas which prevailed immediately after the war, was also latent in many of the nineteenth century writers of most diverse schools; but it became, after the war, largely associated with the Catholic tradition, though it was inspired to some extent by a considerable fear amongst statesmen as to the future of Europe. To the heads of government in most western countries, the first fact that had to be reckoned with was the existence of Russia, not as the scene of a revolution, but as the active centre of revolution; this attitude of Russia towards the whole of the West no doubt gradually ceased to cause quite as much grave fear as at first, since after a while the depressed classes in Europe realised how little freedom had been achieved by the Soviet form of government: in Russia, too, for various causes the experiment had admittedly broken down.

(i) A great many "white" Russians had been employed by the Soviet government who, though nominally on the side of the revolution, were not so at heart, and were obstructing its policy where they dared.

(ii) The industrial workers became disillusioned, as the system was seen to result in loss of trade, and the failure to provide raw material or a market. "No trade" meant that the factories could only be supported out of unremunerative government subsidies: unremunerative government subsidies could not last very long.

(iii) Hence, with increased unemployment came the need for sterner discipline in the Russian cities, to prevent the gangs of workless becoming mere looters, a mob out of hand.

(iv) Moreover, the promised world-revolution tarried over-long: outbreaks here or there, engineered in foreign countries by the propaganda of the Russian revolutionaries, in the end proved ineffective, and showed clearly that they did not command, in any country where they were inaugurated, great popular sympathy or support.

(v) Hence, the flame of idealism burnt down or burnt uncertainly.

(vi) The result was divisions amongst the party: the quar-

rels, after Lenin's death, between Stalin and Trotsky, in which the group that compromised with the strait doctrine of the revolution drove out the extreme party that had been trained by Lenin.

Nevertheless, the Russian Revolution did undoubtedly disturb for a very long time the current of general political thought, and Russian propaganda did alter even the military problems of the countries concerned. For instance, in India where the British had always been afraid of Russian encroachment, the older military policy had been to build all trunk roads and railroads in such a way as to allow the troops to concentrate in the shortest possible time on the Afghan frontier, in order to block (if need be) the Imperial Russian troops marching down. The new problem was to scatter the troops through India so as to hold down everywhere people whom the Russian propaganda had aroused. The new warfare was not of guns and aeroplanes, but of orators and pamphlets.

ROME THE ONE GREAT HOPE

But how to meet this Russian propaganda? This was what disturbed the Chancelleries of Europe. There were only two methods:

(a) To corrupt it by trading with Russia, for no one who becomes wealthy remains a communist: "make Russia wealthy and her communism will fail." But this advice was not approved of by the commercial classes in Europe, because all commerce with Russia had to pass through a commissar who could repudiate all debts whenever they became inconvenient.

(b) To answer it with equal and opposite propaganda, enthusiastic and one. This second alternative was impossible, for there were no longer any ideals held in common in the West. The Russians had against them only a disunited band of nations, with no common faith, no common moral doctrine, and no political creed that could rally the enthusiasm of the youth of the West. How, the chiefs of European governments could not help asking themselves, had this disunion come about? And the answer was immediate and inevitable. It had

come about through Martin Luther. He had, for the first time in the history of the West of Europe, really divided the peoples by destroying a common faith, a common morality (as he admitted), and a common political idealism.

Moreover, in the legends of his life, Martin Luther had thrown his ink bottle at the devil and got rid of him, which was exactly what the devil wanted him to do. Those who believed in his existence, or who were at least vaguely suspicious that he might exist, were thereby forewarned and forearmed: but whoever did not believe in the devil, if there were a devil, was obviously at his mercy. Moreover, the comparative study of religions had proved that no religion had survived for very long that denied the existence of an evil spirit, or an after-death punishment for evil.

Confronted by the fact that the disunion of the West was due directly to the theories and preachings of Martin Luther, the political thinkers of Europe naturally asked themselves whether the mischief of those theories could ever be undone. It was recognised that the need of the moment was for union and for co-operation amongst the nations of the West. But was it possible to re-unite the West? Yes, it seemed that it was possible, for biologists had laid down a principle of their art, that whatever had once been united and was still in its essential parts alive, could again be re-united. Europe, therefore, *could* once more be one. But what could unite it? What common faith or hope, what unity of principles or policy? Again, evolutionary biology maintained that whatever force had once united members, now dis-united and alive, could again unite them: but the West had once been united by the faith and hope, the principles, the policy of Rome.

Therefore, came the conclusion of the statesmen, "We know this, that Rome can re-unite the West": with the further comment: "We know that unless we are re-united, the West is done."

On some such argument, altered a little here and there by local circumstances and local memories, the future that men looked into, ten years after the war, was a future of menace but of one great hope.

At the other end of Europe the Turk alone saw in Protestantism

a form of political hopefulness. To Mustapha Kemal, Henry VIII was the ideal monarch, and Erastianism the true policy for dealing with the spirituality, and a national religion the only chance for the absolutism of the State. Note, however, that though the Catholic reaction to the extreme liberalising tendencies of the after-war policies was sometimes in favour of a dictatorship, yet it was of one tempered by religion, i.e. a dictatorship which was not absolute but conditional upon justice, the moral law, and the irrefragable inviolability of the human conscience.

In Spain and Italy, that tendency had shown itself in a dictator, in France it was only seen as a definite policy in the *Action Française*, for in public life the supremacy of Poincaré (who forced economy on the country, a stable franc, and a rigid payment of the taxes) was due to his power in the elections, and was based on the acknowledged value of representative government. In Belgium, the Catholic youth rallied to the principles of Maurras (the founder of the *Action Française*), and voted him the greatest leader of the youth of the world. To Belgium then, his fellow-leader, Daudet, fled (when he had escaped out of his French prison) as to a country near, friendly, and in some measure sympathetic to his deals.

So whereas the Catholic Church still seemed to many statesmen of Europe a power so great that they had reason to be afraid of it, it also appeared to them as the only power great enough to build up again the shattered unity of the world. Yet there had also come into existence another force, weaker yet more docile (docile so long as it was weak), that also helped to reassure a menaced world of the possibilities of its peace, namely, the League of Nations. Imported into the Treaty of Versailles by the insistence of the President of the United States, the League of Nations lacked only the adherence of the United States to complete its acceptance by the powers of the world's political organism. It came into being on 10th January, 1920.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Governed by a Council of the representatives of fourteen nations (elected from the General Assembly of all the nations

who belong to it) on which must sit a representative each of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan and Germany, it can only act when these fourteen are unanimous, and it can then act only in accordance with the code laid down in the Articles of the Covenant. The Council must meet at least four times each year, and whenever it is called upon to intervene in a dispute. The assembly is the general Parliament of the representatives of all nations, and it is this assembly which elects the non-permanent members of the Council. It must meet at least once a year. It can also interfere with, and even over-rule, on appeal, the decisions of its Council. Without its approval, these decisions remain unconfirmed.

Moreover there is the Secretariate or body of experts who prepare the business and execute the decisions of the League; the Permanent Court of International Justice of eleven judges and four deputy judges elected by the League; the International Labour Office, which includes representatives of governments and of employers and employed; and lastly special commissions which deal with the various activities of the League—armaments, minorities, health, opium traffic, traffic in women and children, etc.

It has already:

(i) Definitely averted threatened wars between Sweden and Finland (1920), Poland and Lithuania (1923), Jugo-Slavia and Albania (1921), Greece and Bulgaria (1925).

(i) Enabled a government in the wrong to withdraw from its position without loss of dignity.

(iii) Afforded unofficial opportunities to foreign secretaries to discuss their difficult relationships without public comment or international suspicion, which would have been aroused had they visited each other's capitals.

(iv) By its committees on labour, medicine, science, education, etc., allowed the co-operation of all nations in the fruits of advanced enlightenment (which were already achieved in some of them, and were now shared in all), and increased the pressure of development in these ameliorations of the conditions of mankind.

(v) It has repatriated 427,000 prisoners of war from Siberia and Eastern Europe, settled many thousands of Greeks from Anatolia (Asia Minor), reconstructed financially Austria and Hungary, and registered over one thousand treaties between members of the League.

The dangers of the League are of course only too obvious:

(a) Weakness and the inevitable spirit of compromise.

Its tendency is to coerce smaller nations, but to leave the greater nations alone undisturbed.

(b) A pacificism which in the name of sentiment imposes on men of freer conscience the denials of the principles of justice.

Yet, the League of Nations has come now to hold a place in the public councils of Europe, and does promise the hope of unity and peace.

At the beginning of the war, Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary of England, as he then was, in a phrase of impressive gravity described what had happened to each nation immediately it went into that terrible experience: "The lamps are being put out over Europe: they will not be re-lit in our time." It is chiefly due to (i) a few leading men in Europe, a handful of statesmen, dominated by the spirit of which Sir Edward Grey was such a conspicuous example, (ii) the League of Nations, and (iii) the hopes inspired by the Catholic Church that in our time these lamps are being re-lit.

The Signing of the Lateran Treaty by the Pope and the Italian Government (June 7th, 1929) is one of the chief signs of the end of a period of trouble and the beginning of a new era: the fulness of the Middle Ages began when the quarrel between Pope and Emperor had been settled and there was peace. The Lateran Treaty marks the end of a quarrel between the Pope and the people. It is the symbol of the end of the quarrel of the Reformation. The spirit of nationality has been received into the Faith.

INDEX

- AACHEN**, 107, 113, 121, 140, 210, 254.
Abelard, 182, 186, 302.
Absolutism, 359, 375, 402, 414, 452, 547.
Action française, 534, 543, 547.
Adrian IV, 129, 135, 180.
Africa, 33, 45, 68, 95, 176, 381, 491.
Agincourt, 225, 342.
Albert of Austria, 206, 233.
Albigensians, 152, 167.
Alcuin, 80, 112, 179.
Alexander VI, 263, 265, 274, 280.
Algeciras, 501.
Alsace, 287, 296, 360, 364, 368, 385, 436, 463, 522, 524, 526.
America, 267, 277, 342, 365, 370, 380, 382, 384, 396, 407, 418, 442, 447, 460, 499.
 —South, 442.
Anjou, 149, 152, 157, 174, 205, 234, 238, 280, 298.
Anne of Beaujeu, 298.
Anne Boleyn, 334, 337.
Anne, Queen, 407, 420.
Anselm of Canterbury, St., 133, 182.
Antioch, 56, 167, 174, 262.
Anti-popes, 124, 130.
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 85, 125, 166, 171, 182, 185, 189, 271.
Aquitaine, 100, 103, 107, 149, 151, 169, 217.
Aragon, 108, 152, 158, 175, 217, 234, 241, 247, 262, 271, 297, 335.
Architecture, 18, 52, 85, 160, 178, 253, 268, 420.
Arianism, 64, 66, 68, 70, 87.
Aristotle, 20, 24, 90, 185, 222, 224, 271, 301.
Armada, 315, 342.
Armistice, 522.
Arras, Treaty of, 226, 297.
Art and Letters, 82, 85, 90, 160, 182, 252, 270, 300, 377.
Artois, 160, 219, 287, 297, 299, 368.
Athens, 17, 62, 172, 238.
Augsburg (Confession, Diet, Peace, Treaty), 289, 308, 310, 336, 349, 355.
Augustus, 43, 49, 58, 113, 125.
Austerlitz, 426, 429.
Australia, 426, 495, 576.
Austria, 135, 145, 170, 204, 285, 352, 360, 363, 378, 384, 388, 393, 396, 399, 411, 425, 429, 434, 441, 445, 448, 450, 488, 502, 505, 513, 521, 549.
Austro-Prussian war, 457.
Avignon, 192, 224, 262, 270, 328.
BACON, 334, 348, 414.
Balkans, 243, 437, 487, 504, 524.
Baltic, 13, 121, 227, 230, 232, 333, 344, 354, 357, 369, 392, 428.
Banks, bankers, 235, 528.
Bannockburn, 249.
Barbarians, 66.
Barbarossa, 129, 135, 139, 170, 188.
Basle, 29, 202, 260, 325, 364.
Bavaria, 82, 106, 116, 121, 135, 193, 204, 223, 229, 237, 281, 354, 360, 380, 387, 389, 401, 426, 434, 449, 522.
Becket, 128, 191.
Belgium, 399, 431, 436, 444, 510, 515, 521, 547.
Benedict, St., 74.
Benedictines, 116, 164, 182, 184.
Berlin, 426, 429, 491, 506.
Bishops, Appointment of, 116, 122, 158, 160, 376.
Bismarck, 457, 461, 485, 488.
Black Death, 163, 197, 341.
Black Sea, 45, 69, 240, 245, 277, 394, 454, 464.
Blenheim, 382.
Blockade, 516.
Blois, 149, 157, 171, 222.
Boccaccio, 253, 270.
Boers, Boer war, 377, 492, 494.
Boethius, 70, 82, 90, 185.

- Bohemia, 135, 144, 195, 197, 202, 204, 210, 212, 237, 255, 281, 344, 352, 389, 446, 448, 522, 527.
 Bologna, 144, 190, 198, 239, 312.
 Boniface VIII, 191, 218.
 Bosnia, 243, 502, 508.
 Bossuet, 417.
 Bosworth, 332.
 Botticelli, 278.
 Bourbon, 217, 248, 261, 311, 326, 367, 378, 391, 411, 426, 434, 436, 441, 488.
 Bourget, Paul, 543.
 Bouvines, 140, 142, 152.
 Boxer rising, 498.
 Boyne, Battle of the, 377, 382.
 Brandenburg, 204, 209, 212, 214, 216, 232, 288, 351, 360, 364, 368, 377, 380, 395, 412.
 Brehon Law, 76, 180, 251, 346.
 Bremen, 227, 354, 364, 385.
 Breton, 107, 183, 298, 384, 520.
 Britain, 24, 40, 50, 65, 68, 75.
 Brittany, 149, 152, 157, 166, 219, 222.
 Buccaneers, 342.
 Bulgaria, 172, 243, 487, 489, 504, 513, 521, 548.
 Bull of Deposition, 338.
 Burgundy, 82, 100, 103, 135, 146, 149, 157, 164, 212, 223, 226, 281, 290, 293.
 Byzantine, 88, 171, 237, 242.
 Byzantium, 15, 50, 62, 96, 102, 109, 110, 113, 125, 175, 212, 243, 260.
 CÆSARS, 30, 47, 49, 124.
 Calais, 220, 292, 296, 315.
 Calixtus III, 263.
 Calvin, Calvinism, 323, 330, 339, 351, 354, 377, 416.
 Camaldolese, 164.
 Cambrai, Treaty of, 276, 325, 330.
 Canada, 370, 384, 391, 495, 516.
 Canon Law, 56, 111, 184.
 Canons regular, 116, 165, 136.
 Cape Colony, 494, 496.
 Cape of Good Hope, 23, 370, 435.
 Capet, Capets, Capetians, 117, 148, 254.
 Capitalists, 237, 252.
 Capua, 36, 457.
 Carinthia, 204, 282, 285.
 Carmelites, 166, 318.
 Carniola, 204, 282, 285.
 Carolings, Carolingians, 98, 117, 121, 125, 129, 141, 147.
 Carthage, 21, 28, 33, 36, 39, 242.
 Carthusians, 164.
 Cassiodorus, 70, 90.
 Castile, 158, 174, 177, 205, 222, 246, 319.
 Cavour, 455.
 Celestine V, 191.
 Celibacy, 308.
 Celts, Celtic, 74, 76, 77, 93, 186, 217, 219, 224, 249, 251, 299.
 Champagne, 128, 148, 154, 171, 173, 217.
 Charlemagne, 73, 75, 80, 86, 94, 102, 112, 121, 125, 129, 136, 139, 147, 151, 159, 175, 179, 182, 188, 240, 254, 270, 281, 424.
 Charlemagne's successors, 116.
 Charles I (of England), 345, 349, 355, 357, 403, 415.
 — II (of England), 345, 366, 371, 375, 403, 405, 415.
 — IV (Emperor), 197, 198, 210, 213.
 — V, 221, 310, 318, 322, 326, 335, 411, 414.
 — VI, 222, 386.
 — VII, 226, 290, 293, 388.
 Charles the Bald, 116.
 Chartists, 421, 440, 447.
 Chaucer, 37, 90, 300.
 China, 166, 491, 497.
 Christianity, 22, 45, 52, 54, 66, 75, 81, 95, 105, 371.
 Church, The, 47, 50, 60, 129, 254.
 — courts (England), 127.
 — of England, 337, 371, 440.
 — and State, 140.
 — Unifying power of the, 129.
 Cid, The, 175, 252.
 Cilicia, 96, 138, 168, 170.
 Cistercians, 165, 176.
 Citeaux, 164.
 Civil wars, 224, 345, 403, 460, 507, 529, 538.
 Classics, The, 90, 92, 115, 182, 261, 269, 378, 531.
 Clement V, 192.
 Clovis, 80.
 Cluny, 163.
 Code Napoleon, 423.
 Colonial expansion, 370.
 Colonists, 342.
 Committee of Public Safety, 400.
 Compactata, 203, 215, 260, 261.
 Conciliar movement, The, 255.
 Concordat, The, 423.

- Constance, Council of, 201, 214, 241.
 — Peace of, 137.
 Constantine, 28, 48, 54, 57, 136, 195, 197.
 Constantinople, 13, 50, 57, 69, 71, 87, 89, 96, 118, 167, 171, 240, 242, 249.
 Consulate, The, 402.
 Corinth, 18, 20, 172.
 Corsica, 36, 39, 56, 209.
 Counter-Reformation, The, 317.
 Creçy, 209, 220.
 Crete, 172.
 Crimean war, 96, 453.
 Cromwell, 403.
 Cross, The true, 167.
 Crusades, The, 66, 85, 128, 138, 142, 152, 158, 160, 167, 179, 240, 242, 246.
 Culture, 131, 182.
 Currency, 25, 48, 65, 235.
 Cyprus, 27, 172.

 DACIA, 44, 56.
 Dail, The, 537, 540.
 Dalmatia, 214, 241, 448.
 Damascus, 169, 521.
 Damasus, Pope, 55, 57, 59.
 Danes, 113, 120, 177.
 Dante, 28, 188, 191, 196, 206, 218, 240, 252, 257, 270, 277, 279, 300.
 Danube, 43, 46, 50, 62, 66, 68, 108, 110, 277, 455.
 Danzig, 227, 231, 400.
 Dardanelles, 511.
 Dark Ages, The, 117, 186n.
 Decay of the Empire, 64.
 Delagoa Bay, 494.
 Delhi, 504.
 Democracy, 19, 40, 135, 402, 525, 529, 531, 534.
 Denmark, 135, 228, 354, 356, 369, 380, 384, 389, 400, 412, 426, 435.
 Dettingen, Battle of, 389.
 Diocletian, 45, 47, 49, 66.
 Directory, The, 400, 402.
 Dominicans, 156, 166, 192, 221, 267, 307, 313.
 Donation of Charlemagne, 124, 194 (*see* Pepin).
 Douay, 338.
 Downs, Battle of the, 360.
 Drake, 342.
 Dryden, 420.
 Dublin, 507, 534.

 Duns Scotus, 166.
 Dutch, 324, 360, 367, 369, 370, 380, 431.

 EDUCATION, 85, 90, 425.
 Edward I (of England), 184, 191.
 Egypt, 13, 21, 27, 42, 58, 65, 73, 95, 168, 173, 402, 426, 445, 485, 500, 512, 541.
 Elba, 430, 434.
 Elizabeth, Queen, 90, 314, 328, 335, 348, 415.
 Elizabethans, 300, 420.
 Emancipation (Catholic), 471.
 Emigration, 407.
 Emperors, The Eastern, 96.
 Empire, The, 86, 204, 281, 357, 400, 412.
 — (the Napoleonic), 423.
 Encyclopædists, The, 91, 182, 417, 438.
 England, 13, 75, 89, 135, 144, 152, 160, 177, 188, 231, 277, 332, 366, 369, 381, 386, 390, 396, 400, 414, 426, 434, 435, 436, 437, 467, 476, 483, 506, 510, 533.
 Entente, The Little, 532.
 Erasmus, 335.
 Erastianism, 547.
 Euphrates, 33, 45, 50, 62, 277.
 Europe, 60, 96, 372, 390, 409, 416, 441, 466, 479, 531.
 — Eastern, 378, 549.
 — Northern, 368, 385.
 — Southern, 52.
 Excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, 316.
 Explorers, 342.

 FABIAN SOCIETY, 486.
 Factory system, 440.
 Farming, 272.
 Fascisti, 533.
 Fashoda, 496.
 Fathers, The, 224.
 Fénelon, 417, 419.
 Feudalism, 120, 129, 131, 141, 161, 242.
 Field of the Cloth of Gold, 334.
 "*Filiouque*," 118, 261.
 Financial collapse (post-war), 528.
 Finland, 357, 369, 385, 425, 435, 527, 548.
 Fisheries, 229, 384.
 Flanders, 140, 149, 157, 223, 296, 322, 368, 381, 516.

- Florence, 30, 207, 235, 239, 255,
 261, 264, 270, 276, 335.
 — Council of, 135.
 Foch, Marshal, 520.
 Fra Angelico, 280, 303.
 France, 13, 81, 130, 144, 146, 152,
 158, 160, 177, 216, 231, 281, 290,
 324, 336, 347, 351, 362, 368,
 370, 380, 384, 386, 393, 396, 411,
 414, 418, 434, 442, 446, 464, 491,
 500, 534.
 France, Anatole, 530.
 Francis I, 224, 281, 311, 325, 388,
 411, 414.
 Franco-Prussian war, 461, 464, 488.
 Frankfort, 135, 195, 208, 353, 449,
 459, 463.
 Franklin, Benjamin, 396, 421.
 Franks, 81, 95, 97, 100, 103, 171,
 224, 281, 423.
 Frederick the Great, 232, 387, 392,
 395, 412, 414.
 Frederick William I of Prussia, 385,
 450.
 Frederick II, 115, 138, 140, 160,
 173, 188, 233, 260, 421.
 — III, 262, 283, 289, 295.
 Freemasonry, 520.
 Free State (Irish), 538.
 Free Trade, 439.
 French Literature, 43, 92.
 French Revolution, The, 397, 421.
 Friars, The, 165.
 Froissart, 209.
 Fronde, The, 365.

 GAELIC LEAGUE (Irish), 535.
 Gallipoli, 243, 511.
 Garibaldi, 456.
 Gascony, 149.
 Gaul, Gauls, 30, 35, 40, 65, 69, 74,
 106.
 General Councils, 50, 57, 61, 96, 109,
 118, 129, 193, 199, 202, 257, 260,
 308, 310.
 Geneva, 326, 354.
 Genoa, 29, 144, 174, 207, 234, 237,
 239, 240, 243, 245, 272, 294,
 319, 401, 434.
 George, Lloyd, 506, 514, 525, 528,
 533, 537.
 Germany, Germans, 40, 44, 66, 69,
 74, 103, 122, 123, 130, 135, 138,
 144, 145, 160, 177, 188, 214, 232,
 255, 272, 281, 295, 320, 336, 354,
 363, 364, 407, 424, 429, 434, 436,
 448, 452, 465, 488, 490, 500, 502,
 505, 508, 522.
 Gibraltar, 13, 24.
 Giotto, 270.
 Girondins, 399.
 Gold, 25, 253, 491, 506.
 Golden Bull, The, 210, 216.
 Gordon, General, 485.
 Gordon Riots, 418.
 Gothic, 77, 90, 253, 270.
 Goths, 45, 50, 66, 73.
 Gratian, 184.
 Greece, and Greeks, 14, 15, 22, 28,
 30, 33, 36, 39, 43, 49, 56, 61, 73,
 80, 94, 109, 114, 175, 240, 243,
 244, 260, 271, 437, 442, 489, 504,
 533, 548, 549.
 Greek Schism, The, 189.
 Gregory the Great, St., 55, 59, 86,
 182, 337.
 Gregory IX, 142, 144.
 — XI, 198.
 Grey, Sir Edward, 509, 549.
 Grocyn, 335.
 Grosseteste, 189.
 Grotius, Hugo, 374, 413.
 Guelph and Ghibelline, 135, 146,
 207, 234, 247, 241, 271.
 Guise, 327, 329, 341.
 Guizot, 443, 446.
 Gustavus Adolphus, 356, 358.

 HAMBURG, 227.
 Hannibal, 35.
 Hanseatic League, 227, 287.
 Hanover, 105, 385, 388, 412, 426,
 449, 459.
 Hapsburgs, 190, 193, 205, 208, 211,
 213, 216, 233, 262, 281, 288, 297,
 326, 331, 351, 360, 367, 380, 411,
 448, 531.
 Hastings, Warren, 419, 541.
 Heligoland, 435.
 Henry II, 127, 153, 180, 326.
 — VI, 135.
 — VIII, 311, 334, 343, 411, 547.
 Henry of Navarre, 329, 414.
 Herschel, 421.
 Hindenburg, 533.
 Hobbes, 416.
 Hohenzollerns, 204, 214, 230, 232,
 283, 287, 364, 387, 412, 506.
 Holland, 140, 206, 210, 223, 225,
 231, 323, 351, 354, 360, 366, 370,
 380, 384, 396, 400, 407, 412, 435,
 436, 522.

- Holy Alliance, 441.
 Holy Roman Empire, 146, 151, 201, 425.
 Home Rule, 251, 485, 507, 534, 541.
 Honorius III, 142, 190.
 Horses, 150.
 Huguenots, 326, 336, 345, 347, 362, 377, 414.
 Hugh Capet, 147.
 Hundred Years War, 219.
 Hungary, 108, 120, 121, 125, 171, 196, 206, 211, 213, 238, 243, 282, 243, 282, 352, 355, 378, 395, 446, 448, 522, 531, 549.
 Huns, The, 68, 108.
 Hus, Hussites, 203, 215, 260, 282.

 IBSEN, 468, 530.
 Immortality, 15.
 Imperial idea, The, 86.
 Income tax, 216, 220.
 Index, The, 312.
 India, 21, 277, 365, 370, 380, 384, 393, 402, 426, 495, 504, 516, 541, 545.
 Indian mutiny, 484.
 Indulgences, 261, 307.
 Industrial revolution, 440.
 Infallibility, 262.
 Innocent III, 59, 125, 128, 138, 152, 171, 176, 256, 265.
 — IV, 144, 189, 256.
 — VI, 197.
 — VIII, 264, 268.
 Investitures, 122, 126, 131.
 Inquisition, 300, 321, 342.
 Interdict, 280.
 Iona, 80, 93.
 Ionian Isles, 435, 443.
 Ireland, 24, 73, 76, 78, 177, 179, 188, 249, 299, 345, 382, 402, 403, 469, 507, 534.
 Irish monks, 75.
 — prose, 93.
 — verse, 92.
 Iron Crown (of Monza), 105, 209.
 Islam, 127, 169, 175.
 Italia Irredenta, 524.
 Italian art, 270.
 Italy, 13, 29, 52, 54, 56, 65, 71, 73, 75, 87, 97, 105, 124, 129, 133, 137, 144, 177, 179, 188, 190, 205, 213, 234, 245, 254, 270, 276, 304, 384, 436, 445, 450, 455, 464, 489, 500, 503, 524, 533.

 JACOBITES, 385, 390, 399.
 James I, 316, 344, 348, 353, 371, 415
 — II, 405.
 Jameson, Dr., 493.
 Jansenism, 374, 417, 419.
 Japan, 491, 498, 525.
 Jena, 426.
 Jerusalem, 27, 56, 108, 143, 167, 169, 173, 234, 262, 513.
 Jesuits, 331, 355, 370.
 Jews, 27, 44, 95, 252, 394, 405, 490.
 Joan of Arc, 226.
 John, King, 140, 152, 181.
 John XXII, 193, 195, 209, 281.
 Jugo-Slavia, 527, 532, 548.
 Julian, 62.
 Julius II, 264, 268, 275.
 Justinian, 70, 82, 111, 183.
 Jutland, 89, 519.

 KAISER, THE, 493, 496, 500, 502, 508, 522.
 Katherine of Aragon, 335.
 Kalmar, 212, 229.
 Karelia, 369, 385.
 Keats, 420.
 Keble, 421.
 Khartoum, 485, 495.
 Kiel, 497, 506.
 Kiev, 369.
 Kilkenny, Statute of, 249, 251.
 Kitchener, Lord, 495, 515.
 Knights of Alcantara, 176.
 — of Calatrava, 176.
 — Hospitallers, 169, 176.
 — of St. Julian, 176.
 — of the Sword, 144, 232.
 — Templars, 169, 176, 193, 218.
 — of the Teutonic Order, 144, 231.
 Knox, John, 339.
 Koran, The, 532.
 Kosciusko, 400.
 Kossovo, 243.
 Kossuth, 446, 448.
 Kruger, 491, 493.
 Kut, 512.

 LACORDAIRE, 542.
 Lake Poets, The, 420.
 Lanfranc, 182.
 Languedoc, 217.
 Lateran, 74, 83, 110, 137, 165, 549.
 Latin, 30, 37, 43, 52, 77, 80, 89, 92, 114.
 Law, 85, 115, 161, 183, 374, 413.

- League of Nations, 522, 526, 532, 541, 547.
 Legion of Honour, 425.
 Leo III, 110.
 Legitimacy, 436, 438.
 Lenin, 511, 522, 533, 545.
 Leonardo da Vinci, 274, 304.
 Liberalism, 506, 542.
 Limerick, Treaty of, 406.
 "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," 422.
Liberum veto, 369, 394.
 Libraries, 278.
 Lindisfarn, 94.
 Literature, 18, 43, 58, 89, 252, 300.
 Lithuania, 213, 231, 368, 379, 527, 548.
 Livonia, 232, 357, 369, 385, 527.
 Livy, 28, 35, 196, 207.
 Local sovereignties, Rise of, 126.
 Lombardy, Lombards, 66, 71, 74, 80, 87, 89, 97, 102, 104, 108, 111, 115, 137, 144, 183, 207, 209, 239, 252, 325, 451, 456.
 London, 221, 252, 381, 415, 445, 447, 492.
 Lorraine, 93, 116, 121, 147, 296, 298, 368, 386, 411.
 Lothair, 116, 135, 146.
 Louis VI ("The Fat"), 150.
 — IX, 155, 216, 293.
 — XI (St. Louis), 218, 248, 286, 293, 295, 298.
 — XIV, 281, 362, 365, 375, 378, 380, 384, 405, 414, 421, 425.
 — Philippe, 443, 446.
 Lucca, 235, 240, 271.
 Lucern, 233.
 Lusatia, 285, 354, 434.
Lusitania, The, 518.
 Luther, Lutheranism, 135, 267, 305, 336, 351, 354, 375, 394, 413, 546.
 Luxembourg, 206, 209, 211, 226, 282, 296, 444, 509.
 MACHIAVELLI, 266, 279, 293, 304.
 Machinery, 440.
 Magyars, 108, 120, 379, 448, 450, 452.
 Mahdi, 485, 495.
 Maine, 147, 152, 297.
 Mainz, 205, 210, 261, 307.
 Malta, 13, 435, 437.
 Mantua, 263, 268, 271, 401, 459, 497.
 Mary, Queen, 335.
 — Queen of Scots, 315, 338, 339.
 Marie Antoinette, 399.
 Marlborough, 382, 431.
 Marseilles, 198, 290.
 Mashonaland, 492.
 Mass, The, 308, 313.
 Massacre of St. Bartholomew, 328.
 Matabeleland (Rhodesia), 493.
 Mauritius, 384, 435.
Mayflower, The, 371.
 Mazarin, Card., 362, 365.
 Mazzini, 446, 451.
 Mecklenburg, 229, 232.
 Medical science, 525.
 Medici, 239, 262, 264, 269, 277, 279, 285, 327, 386.
 — Catherine de', 327.
 — Cosimo de', 237, 264, 277, 280.
 — de', 264, 278.
 — Lorenzo de', 264, 278.
 Medina, 105.
 Mediterranean, 13, 15, 19, 23, 27, 73, 190, 240, 277, 333, 402, 445, 500, 513.
 Melancthon, 310.
 Mercenaries, 238, 275, 294.
 Merovingians, 80, 82, 98, 104.
 Messina, 170.
 Mesopotamia, 512.
 Metternich, 436, 442, 446, 448.
 Metz, 99, 463.
 Michael Angelo, 268, 279.
 Middle Ages, The, 85, 125, 127, 134, 155, 183, 240, 254, 270, 280, 301, 360, 549.
 Milan, 56, 69, 136, 198, 207, 209, 213, 224, 237, 239, 271, 275, 279, 326, 389, 434.
 Milanese, 210, 294, 391, 401.
 Milner, Sir Alfred, 494, 496.
 Milton, 416, 420.
 Minnesingers, 140.
 Minorca, 384, 393, 397.
 Mirabeau, 399.
 Modena, 434, 456.
 Mohammedan, 29, 86, 95, 169, 173, 176, 243, 310, 317, 321, 532, 541.
 Moldavia, 394, 425, 448, 454.
 Molière, 421.
 Money-lenders, 252.
 Montaigne, 332, 373.
 Monasticism, 73, 78, 116, 131, 163, 415.
 Monroe doctrine, 37, 461.
 Mons, 521.
 Monte Cassino, 74.
 Moors, The, 106, 175, 185, 246, 319, 322, 335.

- Moravia, 203, 212, 355.
 Morocco, 500.
 Moscow, 412, 429.
 Mukden, 497, 499.
 Murat, 430, 434.
 Music, 85.
 Mussolini, 533, 542.
 Mustapha Kemal, 532, 547.
- NANTES, Edict of, 330, 377.
 Naples, 87, 105, 166, 179, 196, 234, 237, 248, 268, 271, 273, 276, 279, 319, 434, 441, 451.
 Napoleon, Napoleonic, 230, 281, 401, 411, 422, 430, 436, 441, 447, 485, 529.
 — III, 452, 454, 458, 460.
 Narbonne, 106, 152.
 Nassau, 205, 233, 445, 459.
 Nationalism, Nationalists, 140, 150, 216, 233, 257, 271, 275, 289, 300, 335, 418, 485, 496, 507, 532, 534, 541, 549.
 National re-groupings, 385.
 — Assembly, The, 397.
 Nations, The new, 187.
 Navarino, 443.
 Navarre, 158, 173, 175, 217, 319, 326, 414.
 Navigation acts, 367, 405.
 Navy, The English, 342, 442.
 Nazareth, 143, 173.
 Negro triumphant, The, 531. (U.S.A. post-war.)
 Nelson, 402, 426.
 Neo-Platonists, 278.
 Nepotism, 263, 267.
 Netherlands, The, 255, 277, 295, 322, 336, 338, 341, 359, 363, 365, 377, 380, 411, 435.
 — The Austrian, 390, 400.
 — The New, 370, 380.
 — The Spanish, 382, 384.
 Neustrian (Frankish), 82, 99, 103, 147.
 Newfoundland, 384, 516.
 New Amsterdam, 370.
 New Hampshire, 371.
 New Jersey, 380.
 New Plymouth, 371.
 New York, 380.
 New Zealand, 495, 516.
 Newspapers, 421, 514.
 Newton, 421.
 Nicholas I (Russia), 118, 453.
 Nicephorus, 113.
 Nicæa, Council of, 50, 61, 243, 262.
 Nice, 172, 326, 384.
 Nicomedia, 29, 171.
 Nicopolis, 214, 243.
 Niemegeen, Peace of, 375.
 Nile, The, 14, 496.
 — Battle of the, 402.
 Non-jurors, 416.
 Nore, Mutiny of the, 418.
 Normans, Normandy, 129, 133, 137, 141, 148, 151, 157, 167, 177, 187, 281, 293, 362.
 Norman Conquest, The, 152.
 North Sea, 360.
 North West Passage to India, 342.
 Norway, 288, 435.
 Nuremberg, 210, 214, 288, 310, 351, 358.
- OCCAM, 240, 258.
 O'Connell, Daniel, 258, 439, 469, 536.
 Oldenburg, 105, 229, 428.
 Oligarchies, 19, 237, 239, 344, 375, 411, 543.
 Omar, Mosque of, 143, 173.
 Omdurman, 495.
 O'Neill, Hugh, 346.
 — Shane, 346.
 Orange River Republic, 494.
 Oratorians, 318.
 Ordinances of Justice, 236.
 Orkneys, The, 230.
 Orsini, 190, 260, 272.
 Orleans, 150, 223, 226, 290.
 — The new House of Orleans, 365.
 Ostrogoths, 66, 70, 73, 87.
 Otto I, 120, 125, 128.
 — II, 121.
 — III, 121, 123, 147.
 Ottos, The, 114, 122, 136, 138, 188, 254.
 Ottoman, 242, 244, 445.
 Oudenard, 382.
 Oudinot, 430.
 Oxford, 199, 257.
- PADUA, 194, 209, 239.
 Paganism, 62, 78, 105.
 Painting, 85, 421.
 Palatinate, The, 135, 204, 213, 289, 344, 353, 382, 386.
 Palestine, 22, 25, 27, 59, 73, 95, 143, 168, 170, 510, 512.
 Palmerston, 452.

- Papacy, The, 68, 73, 77, 86, 89,
 96, 102, 111, 117, 123, 161, 166,
 188, 203, 218, 255, 277, 308, 372,
 376, 405, 413, 418, 437, 450.
 Papal States, The, 190, 235, 237,
 266, 313, 401.
 — Supremacy, 244, 259.

 Paris, 99, 101, 147, 153, 160, 166,
 217, 221, 225, 254, 290, 330, 418,
 421, 423, 430, 463, 513, 516, 520.
 — Parlement of, 159, 218, 377.
 — Treaty of, 365.
 — University of, 199, 213, 224,
 325, 377.
 — Matthew, 160.
 Parliament (English), 320, 343.
 Parma, 329, 434, 456.
 Partridges, 333.
 Pascal, 373.
 Patriarchs, 262.
 Patrimony of St. Peter, 124, 190.
 Patronage, 256.
 Paul II, 264.
 — IV, 312, 413.
 Pavia, 98, 102, 104, 325.
 Peasant revolts, 255, 289, 309, 363.
 Peel, Sir Robert, 439.
 Pelagianism, 77.
 Penn, William, 372 (and Pennsylv-
 vania.)
 Pepin, Donation of, 98.
 Pepys, 381.
 Pepper, 371.
 Persia, 14, 17, 20, 27, 45, 50, 63,
 70, 95, 168, 175, 185, 245.
 Persian Gulf, 277, 502.
 Perugia, 240.
 Petrarch, 253, 270.
 Peter the Great, 379, 385, 412n., 414.
 Peter Lombard, 183.
 Petition of Right, 345.
 Pheasants, 333.
 Philip Augustus, 128, 134, 140, 142,
 151, 170, 218.
 — le Bel, 160, 191, 217.
 — II, 312, 315, 321, 324, 327,
 336, 338, 411.
 Philosophy, 16, 39, 85, 90, 182, 300.
 Piedmont, 105, 234, 326, 389, 434,
 451.
 Pisa, 200, 207, 235, 272.
 Pisan popes, 199.
 Pitt, 391, 408, 411, 419, 427.
 Pius II, 263, 268, 280, 420.
 — IV, 312.
 — V, 174, 314, 316, 337, 413.
 — IX, 192, 450, 457, 464.
 Plague, The, 261.
 Plain song (Gregorian), 88.
 Plassey,
 Plantagenets, 172, 217.
 Plato, 45, 90.
 Poetry, 16, 85, 420.
 Poitou, 147, 149, 151, 173, 217, 220.
 Poland, 125, 135, 212, 231, 328, 357,
 368, 370, 378, 385, 393, 395, 400,
 411, 426, 434, 436, 503, 522, 532,
 526, 548.
 Pomerania, 121, 232, 229, 364, 369,
 385, 395, 412, 435.
 Popes, The, 55, 96, 129, 403 (and see
 Papacy).
 Pope, Alexander, 420.
 Port Royal, 417.
 Portugal, 177, 231, 246, 248, 277,
 322, 360, 370, 384, 400, 426, 434,
 441, 445, 491.
 Post-war Europe, 531.
 Poyning's Law, 251.
 Præmunire, Statute of, 195.
 Pragmatic Sanction, 387.
 Prague, 197, 199, 210, 215, 286, 353,
 358, 390.
 Prayer Book, 348.
 Prémontré, Abbey of, 165.
 Presbyterians, 348, 407.
 Primacy of Rome, 88, 134, 262, 308,
 335.
 Primogeniture, 210.
 Prosody (Irish, French, English,
 compared), 92.
 Protestant, Protestantism, 232, 305,
 307, 310, 317, 320, 328, 336, 349,
 354, 358, 363, 372, 375, 380, 413,
 532, 546.
 — Succession, The, 376, 384, 416.
 Provence, 82, 100, 103, 149, 158, 160,
 217, 252, 298.
 Provisions (Papal), 256.
 Provisors, Statute of, 195.
 Prussia, 144, 227, 357, 365, 384, 386,
 388, 391, 393, 399, 400, 426, 429,
 433, 436, 441, 445, 449, 489.
 Puritans, Puritanism, 39, 371.
 Pyramids, 15.
 — Battle of the, 402.
 Pyrenees, 95, 107, 117, 366.

 QUADRILATERAL, The, 459.
 Quadruple Alliance, The, 386, 441.

- Quebec, 370, 393.
 Quietism, 417.
- RACINE, 421.
 Raleigh, Sir Walter, 342.
 Ramillies, 382.
 Rand goldfields, 492.
 Ranke, 268.
 Ravenna, 67, 70, 82, 87, 97, 102, 111, 113, 190, 271.
 Rebellion, The Irish, 536.
 Redmond, John, 507.
 Red Sea, 13, 277.
 Reform Bills, 439 (1832), 440 (1867).
 Reformation, The, 133, 135, 191, 305, 375, 385, 532, 549.
 Reign of Terror, 399.
 Religion, 16, 25, 419.
 — and commerce (as causes of war), 359, 366, 380, 411.
 — wars of, 327, 485.
 Religious movements in England, 476
 Renaissance, The, 90, 254, 263, 270, 276, 279, 299, 319, 332, 335, 419.
 Renaissance, New form of the, 300.
 Rense, 195, 208, 257.
 Republic, The Third, 464.
 Restitution, Edict of, 355.
 Revolution (Belgium), 443.
 — (England), 344, 375, 418.
 — (France), 223, 422, 436, 443, 446, 529.
 — (Italy), 450.
 — (Russia), 511, 529, 544.
 Revolutionary party (Ireland), 534.
 — Tribunal (France), 399.
 Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 421.
 Rheims, 146, 182, 213, 226, 365.
 Rhine, 43, 46, 51, 62, 66, 69, 81, 107, 110, 116, 205, 277, 360, 381, 385, 400.
 Rhineland, 351.
 Rhodes, Cecil, 493.
 Rhode Island, 371.
 Rhodesia, 493.
 Rhone, 102.
 Richard I, 138, 153, 170.
 — II, 181, 224, 246, 255.
 — III, 298, 332.
 — of Cornwall, 158, 173, 205, 246, 281.
 Rienzi, 271, 357, 362, 420.
 Riffs, 533.
 Rimini, 271.
 Riviera, 105.
 Roberts, Lord, 495.
 Robespierre, 400.
 Rodney, 397.
 Roland, The Song of, 107, 252.
 Romagna, The, 190, 198, 269, 447, 456.
 Romances, 252.
 Roman Empire, 43, 64, 121.
 — Law, 43, 52, 76, 77, 183, 300, 320, 375.
 — Legacy, The, 49.
 — Legions, 20.
 — Republic, 402, 451.
 — Wall, 50.
 Romans, King of the, 158, 190.
 Romanoffs, 357, 412.
 Rome, Roman, 13, 19, 21, 26, 28, 49, 54, 56, 60, 63, 69, 71, 73, 87, 97, 100, 102, 104, 111, 116, 124, 161, 166, 190, 196, 209, 217, 237, 311, 533, 545.
 — Council of, 97.
 — King of, 431, 453.
 Romulus and Remus, 29, 30.
 Roosevelt, President, 499.
 Rose, The Romance of the, 90.
 Roses, Wars of the, 292, 333.
 Rothschild, Lord, 528.
 Rouen, 178, 225, 294.
 Roumania, Roumanian, 448, 454, 462, 505, 510, 527.
 Roumelia, Eastern, 487.
 Rousseau, 417, 422, 438, 489.
 Roussillon, 158, 248, 297, 299, 319, 361, 368.
 Royal Bank of France, 418.
 Royal Society, 421.
 Rubicon, The, 41.
 Russia, 232, 245, 277, 357, 368, 370, 379, 384, 389, 391, 393, 396, 400, 402, 412, 425, 429, 434, 441, 443, 445, 448, 453, 487, 489, 497, 502, 505, 510, 524, 533, 544.
 Russo-Japanese war, 498.
 Ruy Diaz (The Cid), 175.
 Ryswick, Congress of, 382.
- SADOWA, 459.
 Sahara, The, 176.
 St. Adamnan, 79.
 St. Albans, 136.
 St. Ambrose, 82.
 St. Angelo, Castle of, 133, 269.
 St. Anselm, 133, 179, 182.
 St. Augustine of Canterbury, 75, 78, 80, 95, 337.

- St. Augustine of Hippo, 68, 78, 82, 114, 165.
 St. Benedict, 73, 75, 80, 91.
 St. Bernard, 165, 169, 180, 183, 186.
 — Hospital of, 165.
 — Pass, 273.
 St. Bruno, 164.
 St. Catherine of Siena, 198, 238, 258.
 St. Columba, 79, 93.
 St. Francis of Assisi, 253.
 St. Francis Xavier, 318.
 St. Helena, 412, 431.
 St. Ignatius, 317, 325.
 St. Joan of Arc, 290.
 St. Jerome, 67, 82.
 St. Lawrence (river), 391.
 St. Patrick, 73, 76, 78, 92, 94.
 St. Paul, 305, 309.
 St. Peter, 54, 57, 64, 101.
 St. Peter's (church) in Rome, 104, 111, 132, 207, 307.
 St. Peter ad Vincula, 131.
 St. Sophia (Constantinople), 72, 171.
 St. Teresa, 318.
 St. Thomas Aquinas, 85, 125, 166, 171, 182, 185, 189, 271.
 St. Vincent, Cape, 402.
 Saladin, 169.
 Salamanca, 428.
 Salic law, 218, 449.
 Salonica, 82, 510, 513, 521.
 Salt tax and monopoly, 220, 273.
 Saracens, 143, 145, 150, 170, 173.
 Sardinia, 22, 33, 36, 39, 56, 87, 247, 389, 391, 399, 401, 434, 451, 456.
 Savonarola, 265, 271, 279.
 Savoy, 239, 261, 382, 384, 399, 401, 434.
 Saxe-Coburg, 488.
 Saxon, Saxons, 100, 105, 111, 121, 125, 135, 227, 232, 358, 448.
 — Shore, Count of the, 52.
 Saxony, 105, 106, 108, 116, 121, 204, 210, 281, 288, 353, 355, 360, 380, 384, 390, 392, 426, 428, 434, 449, 522.
 Scanderberg, 244.
 Scandinavia, Scandinavian, 212, 227, 232, 355, 517.
 Scheldt, 363.
 Schleswig, 229, 385, 436, 458.
 Schleswig-Holstein, 449.
 Scepticism, 46, 58, 66.
 Schism, The Great, 198, 262.
 Scholasticism, 252.
 Science, 421.
 Scotland, 74, 76, 80, 188, 219, 263, 336, 338.
 Scout movement, The, 536.
 Scriptures, The, 77, 92, 115, 186, 224, 304, 308, 309, 313.
 Sculpture, 18, 85.
 Sebastopol, 455.
 Sedan, 368, 463.
 Seljuk Turks, 167, 172, 242, 244.
 Sem, Semitic, 22, 25, 76.
 Sempach, 233, 283.
 Senegal, 393, 397.
 Senlis, 150.
 Sens, 83, 146, 150.
 Senate (Rome), 19, 31, 38, 40.
 Serajevo, 489, 508, 521.
 Sermons, 252, 421.
 Servia, 214, 243, 487, 489, 504, 513, 521, 524.
 Seven Years War, 391.
 Seville, 177.
 Shakespeare, 42, 215, 246, 276, 420.
 Shaw, G. Bernard, 486, 530.
 Shelley, 420.
 Shetlands, The, 230.
 Ship money, 345.
 Siberia, 497, 549.
 Sicily, Sicilian, 19, 22, 25, 33, 36, 56, 65, 97, 137, 140, 144, 170, 179, 234, 248, 384.
 Sicilian Vespers, The, 234, 247.
 Siena, 207, 235, 240, 270, 272.
 Silchester, 51.
 Silesia, 212, 285, 354, 387, 390, 391, 393, 395, 412.
 Simplon Pass, 273.
 Sinn Fein, 536, 540.
 Sinope, 454.
 Sixtus IV, 264.
 Slav, Slavonic, 113, 144, 204, 210, 213, 231, 282, 411, 437, 448, 450, 452, 502, 505.
 Slaves, Slavery, 20, 25, 75, 491.
 Sluys, 219.
 Smith, Adam, 440.
 Smuggling, 24, 427.
 Sobieski, John, 379.
 Society of Jesus, 317.
 Socialism, Socialists, 502, 504, 526 (French).
 Song of Roland, The, 107, 252.
 Sonnet-writers, 253.
 Sorbonne, The, 376.
 Sorel, Agnes, 226.

- Soudan, The, 485.
 Soult, 428.
 Sound, The, 229, 370.
 Soviet system, 533, 544.
 Spain, 13, 23, 36, 56, 68, 71, 73, 75, 81, 95, 106, 130, 222, 231, 255, 272, 277, 281, 321, 330, 336, 347, 353, 360, 363, 380, 382, 385, 387, 390, 393, 396, 399, 405, 407, 426, 429, 500, 517, 533, 543.
 Spain and the Moors, 175, 246, 318, 324, 434, 441, 445.
 "Spanish Match, The," 345, 354.
 Spanish War, The (Fronde), 365.
 Spanish Succession, War of the, 381.
 Sparta, 17, 24.
 Spenser, Edmund, 348.
 Spires, Diet of, 310.
 Spiritual Exercises, The, 318.
 Stamp Act, 393.
 Star Chamber, 333.
 Statuary, 15.
 Steam, 440.
 Steel, 273.
 "Sterling," 227.
 Stoicism, 39.
 Strasburg, 351, 385, 447, 464.
 Strikes, 529, 534.
 Stuarts, The, 343, 375, 385, 390, 406, 414.
 Styria, 205, 282, 285.
 Suabia (Swabia), 100, 103, 281, 282.
 Submarines, 487, 517, 525.
 Sudan, The, 541.
 Suez Canal, 13, 541.
 Suffrage, Women's, 507.
 Suger, Abbot, 150.
 "Suisse," 296.
 Supremacy, Act of, 337.
 Swabia, 121, 135, 139, 205, 288 (*see* Suabia above).
 Swaziland, 492, 494.
 Sweden, Swedes, 228, 232, 326, 356, 358, 360, 364, 368, 370, 380, 384, 389, 392, 399, 412, 414, 426, 435, 503, 548.
 Switzerland, Swiss, 40, 116, 206, 212, 232, 257, 275, 282, 363, 400, 435.
 Syncopation (post-war), 531.
 Syracuse, 19, 26.
 Syria, 22, 27, 36, 40, 44, 95, 98, 168, 174, 445.
 TALLÉYRAND, 436.
 Tamerlane, 244.
 "Tanks", 525.
 Tancred, 167, 170.
 Tangiers, 501.
 Tartary, Tartars, 172, 234, 277.
 Taxation, 25, 161, 220, 222, 272, 275, 278, 299, 333, 345, 363, 372, 418.
 Tel-el-Kebir, 485.
 Temple, Destruction of the, 44.
 Temporal power (jurisdiction, possessions, rule, sovereignty, supremacy) of the Pope, 89, 98, 105, 116, 125, 130, 145, 193, 197, 198, 203, 372.
 Testament, The Old, 14.
 Tetzels, John, 307.
 Teutons, Teutonic, 40, 71, 73, 161, 183, 211, 213, 217, 236, 272.
 Teutonic Knights (*see* Knights of the Teutonic Order).
 Thames, 381.
 Theatines, 318.
 Thebaid, The, 73.
 Thebes, 18, 20, 172.
 Themistocles, 17.
 Theodoric, 69, 78, 81, 83, 90, 111, 113.
 Theodosius, 57, 61, 63, 67, 69, 82, 88, 111.
 Theologians (Spanish), 374.
 Thessalonica, 171, 243.
 Thessaly, 243, 489.
 Thiers, 463.
 Thirty Years War, 344, 349, 353, 358, 375.
 Thorne, 395, 400.
 Thrace, 67, 171.
 Thucydides, 19.
 Thuringia, 100, 144, 204, 206.
 Tiber, 29, 49, 69, 196.
 Tiberius, 33, 39, 45.
 Tilly, 354, 357, 361.
 Tilsit, Peace of, 425.
 Tithes, 28, 44, 408.
 Tobago, 393, 397, 435.
 Toleration, 176, 354, 358, 363, 373, 403, 405.
 Torres Vedras, 428.
 Toulon, 400.
 Toulouse, 152, 157, 176, 217, 428.
 Toulousain, The, 149, 152, 155.
 Touraine, 148, 152.
 Tours, 78.
 Tractarians, 421.
 Trade, 252, 380.
 Tradition, 313.
 Trafalgar, 426.

- Transport, 440.
 Transubstantiation, 309.
 Transvaal, 491, 494.
 — Convention, 492.
 Transylvania, 379, 448.
 Trench warfare, 513, 516.
 Trent, Council of, 135, 194, 203, 310, 330, 336.
 Treves, 205, 210, 296.
 Tribune, The, 196 (Rienzi).
 Trieste, 282.
 Trinidad, 435.
 Trinity College, Dublin, 348.
 Triple Alliance, 488, 524.
 Tripoli, 169, 174, 500.
 Trotsky, 511, 545.
 Troubadours, 140, 163, 253.
 Troyes, Treaty of, 225.
 Tudors, The, 332, 334, 338, 414, 415.
 Tunis, 174.
 Turenne, 361, 365.
 Turgot, 418.
 Turin, Treaty of, 455.
 Turkey, Turks, Turkish, 29, 167, 172, 212, 214, 231, 242, 260, 263, 271, 277, 326, 378, 394, 412, 437, 443, 445, 453, 455, 482, 487, 489, 500, 504, 511, 513, 521, 532.
 Tuscany, 71, 132, 234, 239, 386, 400, 426, 434, 451, 456.
 Tyler, Wat, 224.
 Tyre, 22, 25, 27.
 Tyrants, 238, 263, 279, 534.
 Tyrol, 195, 209, 211, 275, 282, 313, 401, 426.
 ULSTER, 66, 76, 347, 403, 507, 534, 537, 539.
 Uniformity, Act of, 337.
 — (Ireland), 348.
 Union, Act of (Ireland), 409.
 United Irishmen, 408.
 United States of America, 426, 434, 517, 527, 547.
 Universal Suffrage, 440, 453.
 Urban VI, 199.
 Utraquists, 284.
 Utrecht, Congress of, 384.
 — Treaty of, 271.
 VAAL RIVER DRIFTS, 491, 493.
 Valencia, 176, 247, 322.
 Valerian, 45, 70.
 Valladolid, 311.
 Vallombrosians, 164.
 Valois, 154, 217, 221, 223.
 Vandals, 66, 68, 71, 73, 80, 95.
 Van Tromp, 366.
 Vasco da Gama, 249.
 Vatican, 54, 256, 263, 501.
 — Council of the, 135.
 Venetia, 434, 452.
 Venezuela, 442.
 Venice, Venetians, 29, 97, 171, 174, 235, 237, 240, 243, 245, 260, 271, 276, 282, 290, 379, 401, 451.
 — Peace of, 137.
 Venizelos, 505.
 Verden, 364, 385.
 Verdun, 116, 146, 514.
 Vereeniging, Peace of, 496.
 Verlaine, 486.
 Verona, 121, 238, 442, 459.
 Versailles, 391, 420, 463.
 — Treaty of, 397, 525, 547.
 Vézelay, 169.
 Viceroy of India, 541.
 Victor Emmanuel, 451, 457, 464.
 Victoria, Queen, 343, 439, 449, 453, 496.
 Victorian Compromise, The, 487.
 Vienna, 221, 353, 379, 401, 425, 429, 448, 532.
 — Congress of, 433, 441, 443.
 — Treaty of, 386, 459.
 Villa, The Roman, 53.
 Virgil, 43, 67, 270.
 Virginia, 371.
 Visconti, 207, 213, 224, 237, 239, 260, 262, 272.
 Visigoths, 67, 81, 95.
 Vistula, 231.
 Vittoria, 413, 428.
 Vladivostok, 497.
 Voltaire, 417, 421, 438.
 Von Moltke, 488.
 Vulgate, 313.
 WALDENSES, 167.
 Wales and Welsh, 74, 94, 507.
 Wallachia, 243, 394, 425, 448, 454.
 Wallenstein, 355, 358, 361.
 Walloon, 355.
 Walpole, 387 (and *see* 253n).
 War, The Great, 508, 521, 527.
 Wars, defensive and foreign, 282.
 — motives for, 380.
 — of religion, 327.
 Warsaw, 231, 368, 426, 428, 434.
 Wartburg, The, 144.
 Warwick the Kingmaker, 294, 300.
 Wash, The,

- Washington, George, 396.
 Waterloo, 365, 412, 431, 433, 495.
 Wat, 421.
 Watteau, 421.
 Wax, 25.
 Welf, 204.
 Wellington, Duke of, 428, 431, 437.
 Wends and Wendish, 120, 227.
 Wentworth, 349.
 Wenzel, 211, 213, 224.
 Wesley, 418.
 Western Front, The, 513.
 Westminster, 123.
 Westphalia, 105, 227.
 — Peace of, 361, 363, 365, 368.
 — Treaty of, 369.
 Wheat, 65.
 Whigs, 344, 375, 415, 439.
 Wight, Isle of, 52.
 Wilkes, John, 393, 418.
 William the Conqueror, 178.
 — I of Prussia, 462, 491.
 — II (the Kaiser), 491.
 — III (of England), 375, 406, 415
 (and *see* William of Orange, 365,
 381, 435, 444).
 Wilson, President Woodrow, 518, 521,
 522, 525, 526, 534.
 Winchester, 123.
 Windsor, Treaty of, 181.
 Wireless, 487.
 Wittenburg, 307.
 Wool, 165, 219, 236, 333.
 Worms, Concordat of, 133, 143.
 Wrangel, 361, 449, 458.
 Wurttemberg, 287.
 Würtzburg, Diet of, 138.
 Wycliffe, 201, 203, 214, 258.

 XERES, 177.

 YORK, YORKISTS, 45, 49, 51,
 251, 332.
 Young Turk movement, 490.
 Ypres, 514.

 ZEALAND, 206, 210, 223, 225, 323.
 Zeppelins, 519.
 Zollverein, 445, 452, 459.
 Zouaves (Papal), 464.
 Zululand, 492.
 Zurich, 233.


PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY THE STANHOPE PRESS
LTD. : ROCHESTER : KENT


62

EUROPE

in the 16th Century (1559)


The Hapsburgs.


...Spanish Line.

...German Line.

In France.

The Bourbons.

...The Territory of
Charles. e.g. Montpensier.

...The original lands
of Henry IV. e.g. Navarre.





